

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU'S SPEECHES

VOLUME TWO

August 1949—February 1953

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU'S SPEECHES

VOLUME TWO



PUBLICATIONS DIVISION
MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

First Published, January 1954
Second Impression, June 1957 (Asadha 1879)
Third Impression, October 1963 (Ashwin 1885)
Fourth Impression, June 1967 (Jyaishta 1889)

PRINTED IN INDIA BY THE MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS,
COIMBATORE, AND PUBLISHED BY THE DIRECTOR, PUBLICATIONS DIVISION,
DELHI-6

P R E F A C E

This is the second of a consecutive series of four volumes, and contains a selection of the more significant of the Prime Minister's speeches and writings and covers the period between August 1949 and February 1953. In the first volume, the stress was on the gigantic movement that led to political freedom, on the sufferings and struggle that went with it and on the more immediate implications of its final achievement. Here, the emphasis shifts, so to speak, from the revolutionary aspect of India's fight for freedom to the constructive, from a sense of achievement to a growing realization that the journey has hardly begun. This shift was inevitable, for Jawaharlal Nehru mirrors in himself the deepest urges of the Indian people and Asia's renaissance finds an echo in his voice. By the year 1949 a wounded but dynamic India had emerged from the chaos of Partition, determined to regain her nationhood. Hardly had she done so when a host of national and international problems arose which demanded solution against the background of a world gripped by fear and suspicion. "We live in a haunted age, surrounded by ghosts and apparitions, ideas, passions, hatred, violence, preparations for war...", says Nehru, and he makes it abundantly clear that no solution that does not seek to solve the larger problem of world peace can endure.

As the main architect of New India, Jawaharlal Nehru is deeply aware of the fact that freedom is not a triumph but an opportunity. He has no formula, no gospel; he does not hear voices nor does he consider himself to be the agent of India's destiny. And, if he sometimes appears to be groping for a way, it is fitting indeed for the chief spokesman of the aspirations of a country groping for way.

These pages reveal not only a statesman and patriot of rare quality and insight but also a man for whom life never loses its beauty and wonder. The two letters to India's children disclose what is the most lovable, perhaps the basic quality of this unique personality. There is, however, no need to dwell on the personal factor, for the speeches included in this volume are extempore and speak for themselves.

Besides speeches, this collection also contains messages, broadcasts, articles and a foreword. All these have been grouped according to subject matter and the speeches in each section arranged chronologically.

All the speeches were delivered in English, except 'Two years of Independence', 'The New Role of Khadi' and 'The Dignity of Labour', which have been translated from the original Hindi.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INDIA BECOMES A REPUBLIC

TWO YEARS OF INDEPENDENCE

Translated from speech in Hindi delivered at the Red Fort, Delhi,
August 15, 1949 .. 1

A HISTORIC DAY

-Message to the Nation, January 26, 1950 .. 7

REFUGEE AND OTHER PROBLEMS

Speech in Parliament, New Delhi, November 15, 1950 .. 8

THE GENERAL ELECTIONS

Speech broadcast from All India Radio, Delhi, November 22, 1951 .. 11

LOOKING BACK

Speech in Parliament, New Delhi, May 22, 1952 .. 16

LINGUISTIC STATES

Speech in Parliament, New Delhi, July 7, 1952 .. 33

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND PLANNING

THE MIDDLE WAY

Address at the annual meeting of the Indian Chemical Manufacturers' Association, New Delhi, December 26, 1950 .. 44

COMMUNITY PROJECTS

Speech at the Community Projects Conference, New Delhi, May 7, 1952 .. 50

HOPEFUL PROSPECTS

Broadcast from All India Radio, Delhi, June 14, 1952 .. 57

THE DIGNITY OF LABOUR

Translated from speech in Hindi at the inauguration of the Harijan Convention, Wardha, November 1, 1952 .. 62

THE IMAGINATIVE APPROACH

Speech at the Silver Jubilee celebrations of the Central Board of Irrigation and Power, New Delhi, November 17, 1952 .. 65

NO CHANGE IN FOOD POLICY

Speech in Parliament, New Delhi, November 18, 1952 .. 74

ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

Speech in Parliament, New Delhi, December 15, 1952 .. 80

LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS

Broadcast from All India Radio, Delhi, December 31, 1952 .. 92

THE NEW ROLE OF KHADI

Translated from speech in Hindi at the inauguration of the Khadi and Village Industries Board, New Delhi, February 2, 1953 .. 96

	PAGE
ON KASHMIR	
LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE ..	100
Speech in the House of the People, New Delhi, August 7, 1952	
OUR PLEDGE TO KASHMIR ..	109
Speech in the House of the People, New Delhi, August 7, 1952	
INDIA AND PAKISTAN	
WE CANNOT BE ENEMIES FOR EVER ..	124
Reply to debate on the President's Address in Parliament, New Delhi, February 3, 1950	
A PLEA FOR BALANCE ..	135
Statement to the Press, New Delhi, February 10, 1950	
THE BENGAL ISSUE ..	136
Statement in Parliament, New Delhi, February 23, 1950	
MELTING THE CRISIS ..	146
Reply to debate on the budget demand for the Ministry of External Affairs in Parliament, New Delhi, March 17, 1950	
THE RIGHT APPROACH ..	150
Speech in Parliament on the Motion : "That the Bengal situation with reference to the Agreement between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan signed on April 8, 1950, be taken into consideration", New Delhi, August 7, 1950	
THE ATMOSPHERE OF SECURITY ..	162
Reply to debate on the Bengal situation in Parliament, New Delhi, August 9, 1950	
NO-WAR DECLARATION ..	177
Speech in Parliament, New Delhi, November 28, 1950	
INDIA IS OPPOSED TO WAR ..	181
Reply to debate on the President's Address in Parliament, New Delhi, August 11, 1951	
INDIA AND THE WORLD	
A VOYAGE OF DISCOVERY ..	196
Speech in the House of Representatives and the Senate, Washington D.C., October 13, 1949	
FRIENDLY CO-OPERATION ..	201
Address to the East and West Association, the Foreign Policy Association, the India League of America and the Institute of Pacific Relations, New York, October 19, 1949	
ASIA IS RENASCENT ..	214
Speech delivered in the Canadian Parliament, Ottawa, October 24, 1949	
OUR POLICY IS POSITIVE ..	220
Speech while presenting the budget demand for the Ministry of External Affairs in Parliament, New Delhi, March 17, 1950	

	PAGE
A PROBLEM FOR THE UNITED NATIONS ..	237
Message broadcast by the United Nations Radio network from Lake Success, New York, May 5, 1950	
FERMENT IN ASIA ..	238
Speech at the eleventh session of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Lucknow, October 3, 1950	
PEACE OR WAR ..	246
Speech initiating debate on Foreign Affairs in Parliament, New Delhi, December 6, 1950	
THE GROWTH OF VIOLENCE ..	259
Speech in reply to debate on Foreign Affairs in Parliament, New Delhi, December 7, 1950	
THE TEMPER OF PEACE ..	273
Broadcast from B.B.C., London, January 12, 1951	
A GREAT CHALLENGE ..	277
Broadcast from All India Radio, Delhi, January 24, 1951	
WE WILL NOT COMPROMISE ..	282
Speech during debate on Foreign Affairs in Parliament, New Delhi, March 28, 1951	
WE DECIDE FOR OURSELVES ..	296
Reply to debate on the President's Address in Parliament, New Delhi, February 12, 1952	
THE LARGER SCHEME OF THINGS ..	305
Speech in reply to debate on Foreign Affairs in Parliament, New Delhi, June 12, 1952	
DEFINING FOREIGN POLICY ..	320
Speech during debate on the President's Address in Parliament, New Delhi, February 16, 1953	
THE PSYCHOSIS OF FEAR ..	338
Speech in Parliament, New Delhi, February 18, 1953	
ON SCIENCE AND CULTURE	
WHAT IS CULTURE? ..	356
Speech at the inauguration of the Indian Council for Cultural Relations, New Delhi, April 9, 1950	
THE SPIRIT OF SCIENCE ..	362
Speech at the opening ceremony of the Fuel Research Institute, Digwadih, April 22, 1950	
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ..	366
Inaugural address at the Indian Science Congress, Bangalore, January 2, 1951	
THE CRISIS OF MAN ..	368
Address at the UNESCO Indian National Commission, New Delhi, March 24, 1951	

	PAGE
ON MUSLIMS	375
Speech at the Centenary celebration of the Madras Government Museum and the opening of the National Art Gallery, Madras, November 27, 1951	
THE CONCEPT OF MAN	379
Address at the UNESCO symposium, New Delhi, December 20, 1951	
PAST AND PRESENT	386
Speech at the inauguration of the National Art Treasures Fund, New Delhi, February 23, 1952	
THE WAY TO SPIRITUAL REVIVAL	390
Message to the International Buddhist Cultural Conference, Sanchi, November 29, 1952	
TO THE UNIVERSITIES	
ENDS AND MEANS	391
Address on the occasion of the conferment of the degree of Doctor of Laws at Columbia University, New York, October 17, 1949	
THE GANDHIAN TECHNIQUE	398
Address at the University of Chicago, October 27, 1949	
THE AGE OF CRISIS	414
Address at the University of California, October 31, 1949	
BASIC WISDOM	421
Convocation Address at the University of Ceylon, Colombo, January 12, 1950	
DYNAMIC LIFE	429
Address at the University of Saugor, October 30, 1952	
TO CHILDREN	
THIS BEAUTIFUL WORLD OF OURS	435
For the Children's Number of <i>Shankar's Weekly</i> , New Delhi, December 3, 1949	
CHILDREN OF THE WORLD	438
For the Children's Number of <i>Shankar's Weekly</i> , New Delhi, December 26, 1950	
ON THE PRESS	
THE PRESS AND INDO-PAKISTAN DIFFERENCES	441
Address at the joint session of the Pakistan and Indian Newspaper Editors' Conference, New Delhi, May 4, 1950	
LIBERTY AND LICENCE	453
Speech at the All-India Newspaper Editors' Conference, New Delhi, December 3, 1950	
THE MODERN NEWSPAPER	462
Speech at the All-India Newspaper Editors' Conference, New Delhi, September 17, 1952	

CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTION

COMPENSATION FOR COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY 472

Speech while moving an amendment to Article 24 of the Draft Constitution in the Constituent Assembly, New Delhi, September 10, 1949

THE STATIC ELEMENT .. 479

Speech in Parliament while moving that the Bill to amend the Constitution of India be referred to a Select Committee, New Delhi, May 16, 1951

INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL FREEDOM .. 497

Reply to debate in Parliament on the reference to a Select Committee of the Bill to amend the Constitution of India, New Delhi, May 18, 1951

EQUALITY AND THE BACKWARD CLASSES .. 511

Speech in Parliament while moving the Resolution "That the Bill to amend the Constitution of India, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration", New Delhi, May 29, 1951

MISCELLANEOUS

TO OUR SERVICES .. 532

Broadcast from All India Radio, Delhi, December 7, 1949

THE MODERN SYSTEM OF MEDICINE .. 536

Inaugural address at the Health Ministers' Conference, New Delhi, August 31, 1950

THE BUILDER OF NEW INDIA .. 545

Statement in Parliament, New Delhi, December 15, 1950

A HALF CENTURY ENDS .. 547

Broadcast from All India Radio, Delhi, December 31, 1950

THE IMPORTANCE OF TOMORROW .. 552

Speech in Parliament, New Delhi, March 14, 1951

CO-OPERATION AMONG PEOPLE .. 562

Speech at the twenty-fourth annual session of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, New Delhi, March 31, 1951

A RADIANT FIGURE .. 571

Foreword to D. G. Tendulkar's *Mahatma*, Pahalgam, Kashmir, June 30, 1951

THE TRIBAL FOLK .. 576

Speech at the opening session of the Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Areas Conference, New Delhi, June 7, 1952

THE PREVENTIVE DETENTION BILL .. 583

Speech in Parliament, New Delhi, August 2, 1952

INDIA BECOMES A REPUBLIC

TWO YEARS OF INDEPENDENCE

SINCE I first unfurled the National Flag on the Red Fort, two years have been added to India's long history which began thousands of years ago. During these two years, we have seen achievements and failures, we have experienced joy and sorrow. The good work we have done will remain even though we pass away. So will India, though generations come and go.

Great questions face us and our task will not be over till we have answered them. Our objective is to make it possible for the millions of India to lead contented and purposeful lives. We cannot do that till we have solved, to a large extent, the problems that face us.

On a day like this we should try to detach ourselves from the problems of the moment and see from a distance, as it were, what is happening in our country and in the world. It is right that we forget our little troubles for a while and think of the major currents that are flowing in our country.

Thirty years ago there appeared on the Indian scene a mighty man of destiny who lighted our path. That light illumined our minds and hearts and large numbers of our people, forgetting their own troubles and domestic difficulties, their property and family, responded to his call. It was not for personal gain of any kind. Among these there existed a friendly competition as to who could serve the motherland better and more effectively. Our consuming obsession was the liberation of our country.

The star of a free India beckoned us forward. We dreamed of freedom from poverty and distress. We gained our political freedom at last but the other freedom still remains for us to achieve. Before we could do much to achieve

it, new problems came in our way. Sixty lakhs of people migrated to India as refugees. We faced this problem as we had faced others. I suppose we made some mistakes but no one reviewing these two years will fail to appreciate our forward march in the face of all kinds of difficulties.

Unarmed and peaceful, we faced a proud empire, not looking for aid to any other country and relying only on ourselves. We had faith in our leader, our country and in ourselves. This gave us the strength that sustained us during our struggle for independence. If we had faith and self-confidence when to outward seeming we were powerless, then surely we are much better off today when we are a free people with the strength of a great country behind us. Why then should our faith and our confidence in ourselves weaken? It is true that we have tremendous economic and other difficulties to face; it is also true that while we have rehabilitated lakhs of refugees, large numbers still remain to be helped and rehabilitated. But we have faced even bigger problems in the past. Why should we not face these in the same way also? We must not let our minds get entangled in petty questions and difficulties and forget the main issues.

We belong to a great country, a country that is not only great physically but in things far more important. If we are to be worthy of our country, we must have big minds and big hearts, for small men cannot face big issues or accomplish big tasks. Let each one of us do his duty to his country and to his people and not dwell too much on the duty of others. Some people get into the habit of criticizing others without doing anything themselves. Nothing good can come out of that type of criticism. So, wherever you may be, whether you are in the Army or the Air Force or the Navy or in the civil employ of the Government, each one of you must do your duty efficiently and in a spirit of service to the nation. If the vast number of our countrymen apply themselves to their tasks in their innumerable capacities and co-operate with others, forgetting the petty things that divide them, we shall marvel at the speed with which India will progress.

I want you to think for a moment of the days when we fought the battle of India's freedom without arms and

without much by way of resources. We had a great leader who inspired us. We had other leaders, too, but it was the masses of this country who bore the brunt of the struggle. They had faith in their country and their leaders and they relied upon themselves. Today, we have more strength than we ever had. It is, therefore, surprising that some people should feel dejected, have no confidence in themselves and complain all the time.

Let us get back the purposefulness, the enthusiasm, the self-confidence and the faith which moved us at the time of our struggle for freedom. Let us put aside our petty quarrels and factions and think only of the great objective before us.

In our foreign policy, we have proclaimed that we shall join no power bloc and endeavour to co-operate and be friendly with all countries. Our position in the world ultimately depends on the unity and strength of the country, on how far we proceed in the solution of our economic and other problems and on how much we can raise the depressed masses of India. We may not be able to complete that task, for it is colossal. Even so, if we make some headway it will be easier for others to complete the task.

A nation's work never ends. Men may come and go, generations may pass but the life of a nation goes on. We must remember the basic fact that we can achieve little unless there is peace in the country, no matter what policy we pursue. There are some misguided people who indulge in violence and try to create disorder. I wonder how anybody with the least intelligence can think in terms of such anti-national activities. Bomb throwing, for instance, can do the country no good. On the contrary, it further aggravates our economic situation, which is a source of great anxiety to us. Therefore, it is the duty of everyone, no matter what his politics, to help in the maintenance of peace in the country.

The people have every right to change laws and even to change governments and they can exercise that right in a peaceful and democratic manner. But those who choose the path of violence have no faith in democracy. If their way were to prevail, there would be complete chaos in the country

and the condition of the people would deteriorate even more. All progress would cease and the next few generations would have to carry a heavy burden.

I am still more distressed by those who, while condemning violence, join hands with those who indulge in violence. They think only in terms of winning an election and forget that the cause of the country and of the people is bigger than any party. If we forget India and her people while pursuing our smaller objectives, then we are indeed guilty of betraying our country. I wish to emphasize that all of us must understand that our most important objective is the safety and security of India and the prosperity and advancement of her people. That can only be achieved effectively if we stop quarrelling amongst ourselves and try to solve the great problems that confront us by democratic and peaceful methods.

We must look at our problems in a proper perspective. If we are preoccupied with petty problems, we shall fail to solve the larger and more important ones.

We must learn to depend on ourselves and not look to others for help every time we are in trouble. Certainly we want to make friends with the rest of the world. We also seek the goodwill and co-operation of all those who reside in this country, whatever their race or nationality. We welcome help and co-operation from every quarter but we must depend primarily on our own resources. We should not forget that those who lean too much on others tend to become weak and helpless themselves. A country's freedom can be preserved only by her own strength and self-reliance.

We are not hostile to any country and we do not want to meddle in other people's affairs. Every nation should be free to choose the path it considers best. We do not wish to interfere with the freedom of other nations and we expect them to feel the same about our freedom. That is why we have decided not to join any of the power blocs in the world. We will remain aloof and try to be friendly to all. We intend to progress according to our own ideas. We have decided to follow this policy, not only because it is essentially a sound one from our country's point of view but also because it seems to be the only way to serve the cause of world peace.

Another world war will spell ruin and we shall not escape the general disaster. We are determined to make every possible effort in the cause of peace. That explains our present foreign policy.

Perhaps you know that I am shortly going to visit a country which is great and powerful. I propose to carry with me a message of friendship and assurances of co-operation from our people. Keeping our own freedom intact, we wish to befriend other nations. Our friendship with one country should not be interpreted as hostility to another.

Asia is passing through a great revolutionary phase and naturally India has also been affected. In other parts of Asia there is struggle and ferment. This morning's newspaper contained the news of trouble and upheaval in a small but important country of Western Asia. We do not know all the facts and in any event I do not wish to express an opinion. All I want to say is that the prevalence of violence and violent methods weaken a country and undermine her progress.

In Eastern Asia, a great and ancient country is experiencing revolutionary changes of tremendous significance. Whatever our individual reactions to these may be, our policy, namely, that we do not wish to interfere in any way with the internal affairs of other countries, is clear. Each country should have the freedom to go the way it chooses. It is for its people to decide their future. Any attempt at outside interference or compulsion must necessarily lead to evil results. No country can impose freedom on any other. That is a contradiction in terms. The world has a great deal of variety and it should be no one's business to suppress this variety or to impose ways of thinking and acting on others. We should, therefore, survey world events in a spirit of understanding and friendship to all.

Our Constituent Assembly is busy framing a new constitution for India and soon we shall adopt a republican form of government. However, laws and constitutions do not by themselves make a country great. It is the enthusiasm, energy and constant effort of a people that make it a great nation. Men of Law lay down constitutions but history is

really made by great minds, large hearts and stout arms; by the sweat, tears and toil of a people.

Let us, therefore, learn to study our country's problems in the larger perspective of the world and let us not permit the minor questions of the day to overwhelm us. I have faith in India and her great destiny. A country must have military strength but armed power does not by itself constitute a country's real strength. Her real strength lies in the capacity of her people for disciplined work. Only hard work can produce wealth for us and rid us of our poverty. Each one of us, man or woman, young or old, must, therefore toil and work. Rest is not for us. We did not win our freedom so that we might rest afterwards but in order to work harder to hold and strengthen that freedom. There is a great difference between the voluntary labour of a free man for an objective of his choice and the drudgery of a slave. Our labours as free men and women will lay the foundations for a great future and our labour of love for the cause of India and her people will endure; so will the fact that we are building, brick by brick, the great mansion of free India. There is joy in such work and even when we have departed that work will be there for future generations to see.

One of our most important problems today is that of growing more food. We must avoid wasting food at all costs. We must conserve our present resources with great care. We have to tighten our belts. If the co-operation of the people is forthcoming, we shall solve not only this problem but many others. Our petty squabbles and party differences can wait. What is vital and important for us is to keep before us the picture of a great India. India is enduring and will continue to be there long after we are gone.

A HISTORIC DAY

EVENTS crowd in upon us and because of their quick succession we are apt to miss their significance. Some of us give messages on every occasion exhorting people to great endeavour and even these messages become stale for repetition.

Yet, undoubtedly, January 26, 1950, is a day of high significance for India and the Indian people. It does mean the consummation of one important phase of our national struggle. That journey is over, to give place to another and perhaps more arduous journey. A pledge is fulfilled and the fulfilment of every pledge gives satisfaction and strength for future endeavour.

There is a peculiar appropriateness about this January 26, for this day links up the past with the present and this present is seen to grow out of that past. Twenty years ago we took the first pledge of independence. During these twenty years we have known struggle and conflict and failure and achievement. The man who led us through apparent failure to achievement is no more with us but the fruit of his labours is ours. What we do with this fruit depends upon many factors, the basic factors being those on which Gandhiji laid stress throughout his career—high character, integrity of mind and purpose, a spirit of tolerance and co-operation and hard work. I can only suggest to our people that we should found our republican freedom on these basic characteristics and shed fear and hatred from our minds and think always of the betterment of the millions of our people.

We are fortunate to witness the emergence of the Republic of India and our successors may well envy us this day; but fortune is a hostage which has to be zealously guarded by our own good work and which has a tendency to slip away if we slacken in our efforts or if we look in wrong directions.

REFUGEE AND OTHER PROBLEMS

IT HAS been said repeatedly that various matters have not been mentioned in the President's Address or have been inadequately mentioned. I submit, Sir, that the President's Address is not a survey of all the problems of India, important or unimportant. The President's Address, if I may say so, is not modelled on the Address of the President of the United States of America. It is meant to be a brief statement indicating the general relations of India with the world and the work we have before us. It cannot, therefore, in the very nature of things, take into consideration all the matters that have been raised, though they are, no doubt, important. Generally speaking, it is not a controversial document, except that Government policy itself may be called controversial by some people. It is a brief document and certainly not meant to be comprehensive. I would beg the House to remember that. It is a brief statement of the broad lines of the Government's policy made, as far as possible, in a non-controversial spirit. Therefore, much of the criticism is somewhat wide of the mark, although the points raised may be important.

One of the points that is certainly important was mentioned by the hon. Member who just spoke; it concerns Kashmir. Important as the Kashmir issue is, there is nothing that the President could have said about it. Enough has been said about it already and, as the House knows, the issue is at present before the Security Council of the United Nations. It is a little difficult for the President or for the Government to say much about it at this particular stage. I have said a good deal about it in this House and elsewhere on several occasions. When the occasion arises, I shall certainly come to this House and inform you of any new development that takes place.

About the elections, may I assure the hon. Member and the House that in so far as this Government is concerned, we have taken every step that we can and we will take every

step to ensure that the elections are absolutely free and fair and that every group and party has full and equal opportunity. We have impressed this upon the Election Commission and I believe the Election Commission itself has taken great care to see that it functions in that way and it shall continue to do so.

I am perfectly prepared to agree with another hon. Member that the situation of the displaced persons is very far from satisfactory. He mentioned some cases of deplorable and sad happenings. It is no good denying them. But we have to view the situation as a whole and decide what we can do about it. Accepting the criticism of the hon. Member, I would, nevertheless, submit two or three broad generalizations for the consideration of this House. We have had to face a refugee problem of such magnitude that I doubt whether any other country in the world has had to face anything similar. I submit—for the moment I am talking about the refugees from Western Pakistan—that compared with the way in which the refugee problem has been dealt with in other countries, our results have been creditable. I do not say that they are satisfactory; that is a different thing. I only say that they compare well. There have been refugee problems in the past and there are refugee problems even today in many countries of the world—Germany, Japan and many countries of Europe after the war. Refugees from the last war still continue to live in camps in many countries of Europe. That is the first point.

The second point concerns East Pakistan, West Bengal and Assam. The situation is not at all satisfactory, I admit unreservedly. Nevertheless, I would submit to this House that it is rather extraordinary that large numbers of migrants are returning to their homes. No doubt, if they are provided with better conditions they will not return. No doubt, if you provide employment for the unemployed, they would choose to remain here. But the point is that large numbers of Hindus from East Pakistan and large numbers of Muslims from West Bengal and Assam left their homes through fear or apprehension or whatever it was. At that time nothing else counted but immediate fear. I can assure you that something

has happened to make them go back. They have, on the whole, preferred going back to remaining here and the number of people who have gone back, both Hindus and Muslims, is really astonishing. Even in my most optimistic moments I did not expect this big flowback which has taken place during the last six weeks or so. That, of course, does not mean that conditions are wholly satisfactory and that they have no difficulty to contend with. Nevertheless, it does show that there is an improvement in their condition. The other information we have also tends to show that there is a definite improvement, whether it be in the number of dacoities or in the security of life. Much of what the hon. Member has said is true; I am not denying that. But these things have resulted from a large number of factors including certain basic and fundamental conflicts that exist between India and Pakistan. Not that it is so only here; it is so all over the country, which fact raises big issues into which I am not going at present. I do submit that the situation in East Pakistan and West Bengal is far better from the point of view of migrants and displaced persons than it was about six months ago.

The hon. Member referred to the question of citizenship. There is no doubt, of course, that those displaced persons who have come to settle in India are bound to have their citizenship. If the law is inadequate in this respect, the law should be changed. The real difficulty arises in connection with the elections and the date to be fixed for holding them. Now, this House, I believe, once changed the date for the preparation of electoral rolls at the last session with the result that almost all the work that had been done was largely, though not entirely, wasted. We had to start afresh and do everything again. If you go about changing these dates, it means enormous labour, enormous expense and fresh delays. Now it has been complained that by fixing a date for the preparation of electoral rolls, lakhs of displaced people have been disfranchised. But I do not think the number the hon. Member gave is correct. The hon. Member said that fifty lakhs of people had been disfranchised. I do not agree that any such number has been affected, because in any case, a

very large portion of this fifty lakhs came before that date. Another difficulty arises at present. Quite a considerable number of people are going back daily. On an average, the surplus going back may be as much as 1,500 or 2,000 a day. The situation is, therefore, a fluid one. One is not quite sure as to who will go back and who will not. Therefore, it is a little difficult to lay down hard and fast rules at the present moment. Things may improve a little later.

One thing more. A good deal has been said about the Government's indifferent treatment of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. I do not think it would be quite correct to say that it is due to a lack of interest. But it is true to say that much that ought to be done has not been done and cannot be done because of lack of resources and other difficulties. We can appoint a commission if you like. It is easy enough to appoint a commission. But as the House knows, the appointment of a commission is sometimes only a way out of a difficulty, for it makes people think they are doing something when they really are not doing much. We do not deliberately want to delude the public when we know that we do not have the wherewithal to do much good. I may inform the House that, as far as the appointment of the Special Officer for the Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes is concerned, the President has already decided upon this appointment and if it has not been announced yet it will be announced very soon.

THE GENERAL ELECTIONS

I AM going to speak to you tonight about the General Elections. All of you know something about them and there is naturally a great deal of interest in the country on this subject. It is right that each one of you should take an interest in this democratic process which is taking place on a scale yet unknown to history. It is also important that you take interest

as citizens of the Republic of India, the future of which will, no doubt, be affected by these elections. Democracy is based on the active and intelligent interest of the people in their national affairs and in the elections that result in the formation of governments.

Let us first have an idea of the extent to which the General Elections will affect the country. There are altogether 2,293 constituencies in India. These include constituencies for Parliament, that is, for the House of the People and the Council of States and for the Legislative Assemblies and Councils in the States. Altogether 4,412 representatives will be chosen for these various Legislatures.

The number of voters on our electoral rolls is about 176,600,000. The number of polling booths will approximately be 224,000.

Each polling booth will have to be manned by a Presiding Officer, five clerks and four policemen. As elections will not take place all over India simultaneously, part of the staff required will do duty in more than one place. A rough estimate of the specialized staff required is:

Presiding Officers	56,000
Clerks	280,000
Policemen	224,000

To these will be added vast numbers of Government servants and voluntary workers. Indeed, the whole machinery of the State will be especially geared for the elections. The estimated cost of these elections, both for the Central Government and State Governments, is approximately Rs. 100,000,000.

I have referred only to the official staff; but in addition there will be an election agent for every candidate as well as other agents and assistants.

Thus, the number of people engaged in these elections, besides the voters, is very large. Indeed, the entire organization has been built on a colossal scale and is a test for all of us. The gigantic preparation for the actual business of polling has been preceded by a tremendous amount of human labour. To begin with, the electoral rolls had to be prepared. You can imagine what a great quantity of paper must have

been required for these rolls and the vast amount of printing which had to be done.

Unfortunately, many of our voters are not literate and we have, therefore, to provide coloured boxes with emblems for different parties and candidates. This introduces a fresh burden which the Governments at the Centre and in the States have to shoulder. For the purpose, they have had to build up a huge staff which functions under the Central Election Commission. But no amount of governmental organization can make these elections a success unless the people themselves co-operate. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance for our people that they understand all the processes which lead us to their vote and give us their intelligent co-operation.

Many organized parties are running candidates for these elections. It is also likely that there will be some independent candidates. Every party and every candidate must be given a fair and equal chance in these elections. The fact that one party happens to be in charge of government does not entitle it to any special privileges during the elections. Officers of the Government must function impartially. Strict instructions have been issued to all of them by the Central and the State Governments, that they should carry out their duties with the strictest neutrality. The law has laid down penalties for any improper conduct on the part of a public servant. The Election Commission has also issued similar warnings on several occasions and suitable action will certainly be taken in regard to improper or illegal conduct.

Candidates and their agents must remember their duties and obligations and make it a point to be well acquainted with the complicated law on the subject of elections. Any error or lapse may disqualify them.

The Ministers of the Government, many of whom will themselves be standing as candidates for election, have a difficult task before them. They must not utilize their official position to further their own election prospects in any way. They must try to separate, as far as possible, their official duties from their electoral or private work. Detailed instructions to this effect have been issued.

It should always be remembered that the National Flag must not be used or exploited for party purposes. Indeed, there are strict rules as to when the National Flag may be used officially. It must not be used for any election purpose.

The whole object of democratic elections is to ascertain the views of the electorate on major problems and to enable the electorate to select their representatives. Parties place their programmes before the public and carry on intensive propaganda to convince the electorate of the virtues of each individual programme as well as of the demerits of other programmes. These conflicting approaches are supposed to educate and enlighten the electorate and enable it to choose rightly.

For some reason, elections cause a great deal of excitement and sometimes even passion. Unfortunately, this excitement may also lead to improper behaviour and to a lowering of normal standards of democracy. We have to be on our guard against this. It is of the utmost importance that all of us, whatever the party to which we belong, should maintain a high level of propriety and decorous behaviour. Our propaganda by speech or in writing should not be personal but should deal with policies and programmes. It should on no account be allowed to degenerate into personal criticism and abuse. The standard we set up now will act as a precedent and govern future elections.

The elections have already begun and polling has taken place in some of the remote valleys of Himachal Pradesh. This had to be done now because in mid-winter the mountain passes are closed and travelling becomes very difficult. For the same reason, a few constituencies in the mountainous parts of Uttar Pradesh will poll next February. These are exceptional cases and polling will take place over the length and breadth of the country in January on the dates which have already been announced.

I have given you a simple and rather bald account of these elections. I should like you, however, to try and realize the deep significance of this great adventure of the Indian people. Hundreds of millions of people in India will

determine the future of this country. They will put their voting papers in terms of thousands of ballot boxes indicating their choice and will or should do so peacefully. Out of these voting papers will emerge the Members of the Parliament of India and of the State Assemblies and we shall accept the result of this election without question.

That is the essence of democracy. All of us naturally want the cause we represent to triumph and we strive for that end. In a democracy, we have to know how to win and also how to lose with grace. Those who win should not allow this to go to their heads, those who lose should not feel dejected.

The manner of winning or losing is even more important than the result. It is better to lose in the right way than to win in the wrong way. Indeed, if success comes through misconceived effort or wrong means, then the value of that success itself is lost.

There have been interminable arguments about ends and means in India. Do wrong means justify right ends? So far as we, in India, are concerned we decided long ago that no end, for which wrong means were employed, could be right. If we apply that principle to the elections, we must come to the conclusion that it is far better that the person with wrong ends in view be elected than that the persons whose aims are worthy should win through dubious methods. If dubious methods are employed, then the rightness of the aims becomes meaningless.

I lay stress upon this because it is important and because there is a tendency, during election time, to disregard all standards of behaviour. I earnestly hope that every candidate along with his supporters will remember that to some extent he has the honour of India in his keeping and conduct himself accordingly.

For the 4,412 seats to be filled, there are innumerable applicants. Out of these, a limited number will be chosen to contest the seats, so that there will be a large number of people who are not chosen as candidates or who, being chosen, do not succeed. I hope that those who fall out in the first or the second round will not take it too much to heart.

There is a mistaken impression that one can serve India only if one goes to the legislatures. No doubt people can serve India in the legislatures but perhaps they can do so much better outside. Elections will come again and there is no point in getting too excited about them. Let us face them calmly and take them in our stride.

I should like to add something I have often said before. We owe a special duty to our minority communities and to those who are backward economically or educationally and who form the largest part of the population of India. We are all clamouring for our rights and privileges. It is more important to remember our duties and responsibilities.

Let us then face this great adventure of our General Elections with good heart and spirit and try to avoid ill-will even in regard to those who oppose us. Thus, we shall lay the firm foundations of the democratic structure of this great Republic.

LOOKING BACK .

I HAVE listened with care and earnestness to this four-day debate and have sometimes been astonished at the things that have been said. I am perhaps at a disadvantage compared with hon. Members on the opposition benches, because I must speak with restraint. I cannot be casual about other countries; I cannot either condemn or praise them in an unrestrained manner. Hon. Members will appreciate that the foreign policy of governments is not carried on in the same way as public meetings are carried on and that the phraseology which comes easily to some hon. Members on the other side of the House cannot be used when responsible people speak about other countries.

First of all, I should like to remove, if I can, the strange misconception that exists about the President's Address.

Hon. Members have complained that many things were overlooked in the Address. Hundreds of amendments have been proposed or hinted at. It must be realized that the Address is not meant to be a catalogue of all the things that have to be done. It is a brief, concise statement, with occasional references to foreign policy or to the next session of Parliament. This session, however, is a budget session and, as such, not much legislation can be undertaken, as is pointed out in the President's Address. In any event, it is neither possible nor desirable that the President's Address should contain long lists of the things we wish to do. Therefore, complaints about the summary nature of the Address betray certain misapprehensions about the situation. An hon. Member from Manipur spoke of the tribal people, in particular about the Nagas. I attach the greatest importance to the tribal people of India and I hope that this House will consider the matter more fully at the proper time, not only because of the large number of tribal folk in the country but also because they have a very special culture which should be protected and encouraged to advance along the lines of its own genius. I do not want the tribal culture of India to be overwhelmed or exploited just because the people to whom it belongs happen to be simple folk.

Some hon. Members complained that nothing was said about the refugees in the Address. On a previous occasion, full particulars of the rehabilitation of refugees were given in the President's Address. I do not see the point of repeated references unless hon. Members merely wish the President to go on saying that the Government wishes well by the refugees.

I should like to say a few words about something Dr Mookerjee and perhaps one or two other Members opposite said. They asked the Government to co-operate with the Opposition in regard to the policies that are likely to be pursued. We would welcome co-operation from every Member of this House, whether he sits on this side of the House or on the opposite. It is possible that there are basic differences of opinion but I feel sure that there is a large field on which there can be co-operation. Where there is difference of opinion, it is always a good thing to see and

hear the other point of view before finalizing one's own. Naturally, the Government has to make its own decisions; but in doing so, it certainly wishes to consult and have the views of the other Members of the House, whoever they might be.

Having said that, I would like to add that it is not always an easy matter. Stress has been laid by some hon. Members on the fact that the majority party in this House represents about 45 per cent of the electorate. I take that figure to be correct because I have no means of judging it myself; but then, of course, the question arises as to what mathematical percentage hon. Members on the other side represent. It will interest the House to know that the Members of the Communist Party plus the People's Democratic Front of Hyderabad, etc., represent 4.45 per cent. The Socialist Party represents 10.5 per cent, the K.M.P. Party 5.8 per cent and the Jan Sangh 3 per cent. The Scheduled Castes Federation represents 2.3 per cent, the Independents 1.5 per cent and so on till the fractions become infinitesimal. The hon. Members who form the Opposition represent a great variety of opinion—I say so with all respect—and if colours were to represent it, there would be scarlet, all hues of red, pink, yellow and deep blue. If I describe the representation in the normal language of the West, we have in the Opposition every shade of opinion from extreme left to extreme right. These various opinions hold together under the stress of circumstances; often there are marriages of convenience, followed by rapid divorces. On the whole, these strange bedfellows consort together because they share the spirit of opposition to the majority group. I am not criticizing; I am merely pointing out the fact that where you have such a motley array, consultations are not easy to hold. But I do wish to stress that we are desirous of co-operation wherever possible. We welcome the Members of the Opposition to this House because they undoubtedly represent a certain section of Indian opinion and also because vigorous opposition does not allow of complacency. If I may strike a personal note, the faces of old comrades who now belong to the Opposition bring back memories of the past to me. I do not wish

to forget them and I refuse to accept that there is no way of co-operating with those who gave us their co-operation in the past. It is in this spirit that I extend my hand to those on the opposite side of the House.

It would be easy to address my friends in an argumentative manner, to bandy words with them or to score debating points over them; but the matters we are considering on this occasion have too grave an import for me to do so.

An hon. Member told me that I had lost my place in history because of my attraction for mere tinsel. Well, what history does to me or to another individual is of little consequence. What happens to India and her millions is, however, a matter of the greatest consequence. Therefore, forgetting the personal aspect for the moment, I should like to direct your attention to certain basic facts of the situation.

Perhaps, there will be great differences of opinion when we consider important things like the economic issues confronting our country, even though a great deal of agreement exists as to the ideals and objectives. We may have differences about the methods of achieving those objectives or the speed or the cost; but there is a certain vital method of approach which has obsessed my mind and which, I hope, other hon. Members will also consider. You may have principles and ideals but you cannot divorce them from the particular context in which you are working. The Communist Party in India has changed its policy many times in the last few years. It is quite free to do so. It is not for me to lay down their policy. I am merely pointing out that they changed their policy repeatedly, because they found themselves off the track, because they found themselves losing what they aimed to get and what they knew to be most important, that is, the confidence of the Indian people. They were compelled by circumstances to give up the very things for which they had been clamouring so loudly a few months before. It goes to show that one cannot pursue an ideal regardless of its context or consequences. If one does, one's ideals get lost and other things which one believed to be safe also go with them.

Recent history, particularly in Europe, shows how conflicts between various progressive forces resulted, not in the victory of those forces but in the victory of the most naked form of fascism. People talk about revolution, perhaps believe in it and perhaps work out the consequences; but, because they do not adequately judge the circumstances, they act wrongly, thus opening the door to counter-revolution. In spite of active progressive movements, something completely reactionary holds the field in the country. It is not enough to strive for great objectives: it is equally important, if not more so, to achieve them through right methods. I suppose I shall be told that this is a platitude; but all the great truths of the world are ancient platitudes. And in any case, the well-worn *cliches* hon. Members of the Opposition often indulge in are no answer to ancient platitudes.

Four and a half years ago, in August 1947, independence came to us suddenly and, so far as the British were concerned, peacefully. That was an advantage because a peaceful transfer such as we had made it easier for us to build than it would otherwise have been. I wonder how vividly Members remember that period. It is history now and the public memory is short. However, enormous upheavals, migrations and massacres followed. We had suddenly to face a situation in which the services—the army, the police, the telephone, the telegraph, the wireless and all means of transport—were dislocated. Then came the migrations of millions of unhappy people who had lost everything. I do not know of a single instance of this kind in history. Well, we had to face this and much more. Reactionary forces disapproved of the change-over from the British to the new nationalist Government and wanted to undermine the latter. Feudal, communal and other elements naturally did not want the new Government to work for social and economic change. To support the communal upheaval all kinds of counter-revolutionary movements started in northern India. Our friends from the South may not have any idea of all these because they were so far from the scene of action. The reactionary forces, however, could not have triumphed because they did not have enough strength for that. For a period, the future of India

hung in the balance because these forces had a destructive strength which, if it had triumphed, would undoubtedly have spread all over India. We should have had a long period of anarchic violence for no purpose. India would have been disrupted and the States would have fought amongst themselves. In other words, we would have repeated that period of our history in which the British power established itself in India.

Fortunately, things did not come to such a pass. But it took us years to control this grave situation and to arrange for the rehabilitation of the refugees.

At such a time, it would have been the duty of any government India might have had to try and re-establish law and order and to see that the unity and stability of the country were maintained. Our economic and social ideals had to be shelved, because they could not have flourished unless India was united and unless there was a measure of peace and stability in the country. It was because of such considerations that we thought it essential to lay the greatest stress on bringing conditions back to normal.

We were still trying to establish order in the country when trouble started in Kashmir followed shortly afterwards by trouble in feudal Hyderabad. To be quite frank, no one knew in those years at what moment there might not be war with Pakistan. We lived on the verge of a crisis for a considerable period, not knowing when the Kashmir struggle might turn into war. We were also apprehensive lest Hyderabad should lead to war. We, on our part, were determined not to go to war with Pakistan but we did not know what the people or the Government of Pakistan would do. Naturally, we had to be prepared for all contingencies. In this hour of great national peril, which was certainly not a Congress Party matter, I regret to say that we did not get such co-operation from any of the groups and parties represented on the other side of the House. The communal parties aided and abetted these disruptive tendencies and our friends of the Communist Party tried to take advantage of a national difficulty by causing trouble all over the country, both in small ways and big. During the months when the

peril to the country was at its greatest, the communists let loose a violent movement in Telengana. Surely, the eloquent Members of the Opposition cannot have been ignorant of the background of the country at this time and yet they did things which might well have shattered India and made it go to pieces. That their sympathies were just and their cause noble is irrelevant, because the cause itself was bound to suffer and fail if they did not safeguard the interests of a united India.

Hon. Members have spoken of the currents of history and of historical forces. By all means let us judge things in the context of history and historical forces. Let us beware of where the historical current is leading us; if that current itself goes over a precipice, it will be dashed into a thousand little streamlets and will no longer be a current. In those critical days, the first objective of every Indian should have been to see that India held together and remained united.

I should have drawn parallels with other countries to bring my point home but I do not wish to make invidious comparisons or speak ill of any country. Of course, we as a government have also made mistakes; we could have done many things which we did not do and we should have avoided doing some things we did. I admit our failings; but I do submit to this House that this Government—I may even say, the Congress Party—has performed an essential historic function by holding India together and by laying down the basic foundations on which can be built the future social and economic structure of India. I would say that the Congress satisfies the same need in the country even to this day. The Congress Party has gained a large measure of sympathy from the public and continues to do so. The moment it ceases to perform its duty or fails to change or prepare itself for new tasks, that moment the Congress will have become a spent force. To function effectively, a government must attune itself to the current of human events and history. If, on the other hand, it diverges from reality, then it will stagnate and cease to be.

With respect to the Communist Party, I would like to repeat something I have often said before. I recognize the worth of many individuals in the Communist Party. They

are brave people. However, I am compelled to add that they sometimes seem to be completely out of touch with the present-day world. A strange thing to say of a party which considers itself to be the vanguard of human progress! I admit that there is something about their theories which, to some extent, justifies their claim. There is something about them which seems to recognize the direction in which, I think, the world will ultimately go; but they also have something which makes them as rigid as the old religious bigots. So far as I am concerned, I have always refused to bow to the bigotry of any religion and I likewise refuse to bow to the bigotry of this new religion.

In the present phase of human history, we stand on the verge. We may be led to grave disaster or to a new world and we must decide which of the two should have our support. Of course, I cannot lay down any rules of behaviour but it is obvious enough that the way of war is not the way we or any country, for that matter, should pursue; and war does not only mean actual warfare. What is nowadays called a 'cold' war is dangerous, not only because it leads to a shooting war but also because it coarsens and degrades humanity and because it threatens to surround us with hatred, anger and violence.

I cannot offer any logical proof of this but I am absolutely convinced that the way of hatred, violence or anger is bound to lead us astray. And indeed, recent history affords examples of how disastrous a shooting war or a cold war can be. We may apportion the blame to this party or that and have our own private or public opinions but that will not help in the least. It passes my comprehension how any social or economic order can be established in a war-shattered country. It may, perhaps, take generations just to overcome the ravages of war and to restore the country to some semblance of order. Those who disapprove of communism and consider it an enemy cannot conceivably put an end to communism through war. What will happen after that war, I do not know, except that large-scale destruction and anarchy will seize the world.

I do not think that it is right for us—either as individuals or as a nation—to follow a path which coarsens and degrades us and which leads to the international vulgarity we see all

around. If hon. Members of the Opposition will forgive me, the methods they adopt in the national sphere coarsen and degrade them, even though their ultimate motives are worthy. I do not say that the methods of my colleagues are always worthy or refined but it makes a good deal of difference whether coarse methods are adopted by a group deliberately or whether an individual slips into them through human weakness. Therefore, I wish to have no co-operation with violence or coarseness or vulgarity. I would appeal to hon. Members of the Opposition to feel that and act the same way. It is obvious that violence, vulgarity and coarseness degrade people; once you let them enter into you, it is not easy to get rid of them. India is a large country in which many forces are at work. Some tend to disrupt, others to consolidate. Today, it is a matter of the utmost consequence that the disruptive forces in India do not gain strength. If we indulge in violence even for a supposed good cause, I have not the shadow of a doubt that it will result in ultimate disruption. It may mean civil war, which, from the standpoint of vulgarity, coarseness and the spirit of violence, is worse than international war. It is because of this that the promotion of law and order becomes part of the normal business of a government. As I said, law and order are words I do not fancy very much but it is the bounden duty of any government, any group or any individual who thinks rightly, to prevent violence, to prevent the degradation or disintegration of our public life and the civil conflicts that it may bring about. We cannot have both civil conflict and economic progress at the same time. If we wait for economic progress till after we have resolved civil conflicts, we shall have to pay a terrible price for it.

I admire the achievements of great countries like Russia and China. I do not, however, admire everything that has happened there. First of all, it is well to remember the colossal price that was paid in the Russian Revolution. How far we are prepared to pay that price, I do not know. With all respect to the leaders of the Russian people, I wonder whether they would not try other ways of achieving their ideals if they had another chance. I doubt that they would

choose violence again. However, that is a matter of opinion. We must also remember that it is now more than 35 years ago that their revolution began. It is not fair to compare the results of such a long period of intense effort with ours. Besides, the Russian people started with a fairly clean slate and with absolute power to do what they wanted to; even so, it has taken them a long time to achieve their aims.

An hon. Member spoke of education. It is highly important, of course; and I deeply regret that we are not able to do what we should in the field of education. The Russian people and their leaders very rightly attached the greatest importance to compulsory education after the Revolution. And yet, in spite of their enthusiasm, it took them thirteen years to make compulsory education available to every single individual in that great country. I know that in the early days the Russian Revolution went through years of civil war and other difficulties; hostile forces from outside had also to be dealt with. We are faced with similar difficulties.

If we take to the sword, others will also do the same and nobody knows whose sword will be the longest in the end. Whatever the ultimate result of violence may be, we will lose enormously. Apart from the loss of time, which is really lack of progress, we will also pay in human misery and in human resources.

China is a country for which I have the greatest admiration. There have been big changes there. The hon. Member Mr Hiren Mukerjee suggested that we emulate China. I will be glad to do so as far as I can but I would like to remind Mr Hiren Mukerjee that till only a year ago, China was looked upon as a country where corruption, black marketing and every kind of evil prevailed. Six months ago, the Government of China said that they were shocked and amazed at the amount of corruption in China. They started a great movement, in which the biggest people were involved; and effective steps were taken to end corruption. My point is that the situation in China today is not quite what it was a year ago. Perhaps, the People's Government of China is more effective than we are; let us by all means try to emulate them in this respect.

After Independence we had gigantic tasks before us and we had constantly to face difficulties, turmoil and trouble. There were the post-war difficulties, difficulties followed the Partition and there were the difficulties due to constant tension with Pakistan. Apart from natural internal disasters, like earthquakes, floods and drought, of which there were so many, we had to face the Kashmir and Hyderabad issues. We should, of course, expect some natural disaster every year and provide for it but I must say we have been particularly unfortunate in this respect. I have said before that the parties of the Opposition represented here were not very helpful during those years. Of course, they might well have differed with us in matters of high policy; instead, they hindered us in every little thing. Let us take the example of food procurement which is an essential thing. Many respected people have tried to prevent us from having food subsidies. Some of them even advocate a scorched earth policy so that the Government may be unable to get enough food for the people. It is easy to see that the object, far from co-operation, was to injure the Government. The way chosen to injure the Government was to injure the people of India. It is open to Opposition to go against the Government but it is dangerous, evil and cowardly to hit the very people whom you seek to serve in order simply to shake and weaken a government.

During these last four or five years we have had to contend with a continuous barrage of propaganda, vituperation and condemnation. I would like to ask the hon. Members on the opposite side of the House whether the propaganda that was conducted against us was justified in truth. I believe we can stand comparison with any country so far as our achievements in the last four or five years are concerned. When the great scheme of building the Dnepropetrovsk Dam was undertaken as part of the first Five Year Plan of the U.S.S.R. I remember that the whole country buzzed with it because the people knew that it was to be the foundation of many other and greater schemes. We, on the other hand, are condemned and criticized when we are attempting something bigger here.

V 287 M 83x K4.2 31416

There are at least three major schemes, now in operation, that are much bigger than the one in Soviet Russia. I am merely stating a fact without making invidious comparisons. I am quite sure that progress, such as we have made, would have evoked praise from the hon. Members opposite if it had been in Russia or China.

May I point out that such an attitude is perverse and jaundiced and indicates a closed mind? I agree that, owing to the fact that our resources are limited, we in this country have had to concentrate on small schemes which will bring quick results; but if the country is to be industrialized major schemes will also be necessary. In fact, industrialization has been measured by the amount of electric power that a country can produce. I am sure that the hon. Members of the Opposition remember that *Lenin is believed to have described communism as Soviet Russia plus electricity*. I am anxious to impress on the House that whatever has been done in India in these five years cannot be dismissed as insignificant. Foreigners, even those from the great lands of Russia and China, have often been surprised at the measure of our achievements. Not that they necessarily agreed with our policy. Unfortunately their access to news about India is limited and those who do supply them with information about this country are full of their own ideas and only too readily condemn everything we have done.

Surely, not everything that the Government has done in these four or five years was bad. If you condemn everything, your condemnation is not really worth anything. Your point of view can be valuable only if you look at the whole picture and give credit where it is due and blame where it is necessary. I should like hon. Members to go and see for themselves some of the great river valley schemes. We shall welcome them. I should like them to visit—here in Delhi if they like—our great laboratories. Everybody who has seen them has been impressed by them.

I can say with some confidence that there is hardly any other country in the world, perhaps including Russia also, which can claim to have laid the foundations of scientific progress as securely as we have in so short a period of time.

It is true that Russia is far more advanced than we are but I am referring to the initial stages of development. The rate of development depends on the momentum with which we start off. For instance, this enormous undertaking at Sindri for the manufacture of fertilizers, the telephone factory at Bangalore, the Chittaranjan Locomotive Works—all these are really worth-while achievements of which we can be justly proud. It is no good cavilling at these things. Let us cavil at other things, if we must.

There are many among our countrymen who have been abroad—I am not referring only to the hon. Members opposite—whose chief function it has been to run India down while they have been away. This is not what most foreigners do. At home perhaps they quarrel among themselves but when they go abroad they speak favourably about their own country rather than run it down. There are some who have spoken against our National Flag, our National Emblem, the Asoka Chakra, or our National Anthem. These are not party symbols; they are National symbols. If any group or party does not accept them, it offends against national values and traditions.

At the beginning of the debate, one of the hon. Members from the other side of the House made what seems to me to be an astonishing statement; he described the President's Address as a declaration of war on the people of India. I suppose the phrase is parliamentary and he has every right to use it. If that is the way he feels, then there is a war on between him and us.

I cannot imagine anything more fantastic; I challenge him to sit down with me and go through the President's Address phrase by phrase, word by word and then to explain to me what he means by the statement. There was, I believe, another hon. Member who referred to the same Address as being callous. He had every right to say that the President's Address was full of platitudes, if that was his judgment. But who are these people on whom this war has been declared? Surely, not the people of India. Even if it is only 45 per cent of them, we also represent the people of India here in this House. Our President was also elected by the people of

India. Do the hon. Members of the Opposition seriously claim to be the sole repositories of the people's confidence? I am amazed that they do and I do feel strongly that it was wrong of them to have used such language in describing the President's Address. This warped outlook is by no means uncommon. In fact, we have come up against it in regard to many other matters also. Look at the events of the last few weeks. My remarks do not apply only to the party which the hon. Members represent but to others, too. Time and again we had heard of walk-outs from the various Assemblies by certain sections of the House when the Governor or the Rajpramukh entered it. I consider such conduct extraordinary. One may like or dislike a particular Governor but he is the representative head of a State. When he enters the House, one normally pays one's respects to him and this is not a personal matter. But there have been deliberate affronts to the heads of States. I cannot help thinking that this has become a habit with this party of walkers-out! I hope that people will give up these ways, for they are relics of the past.

In India we have very grave problems to face. Unless this Government or any other for that matter can solve them, it is of no use. Let me put it differently. So long as this Government or the party which forms the Government acts as a liberating force in this country, it will function effectively. Once it becomes what hon. Members think it has become, it will have ceased to be a liberating force and become a restrictive, repressive force. Then it will fade away in the process of history. The mere fact that we have returned to this House after one of the biggest elections in history shows that the people of India—a very large number of them at any rate—still think us capable of solving the country's problems.

There are a number of other matters to which I should like to refer briefly. Dr Mookerjee mentioned the subject of passports between India and Pakistan. We had convened a conference to discuss this matter but no agreement was arrived at. There is not much more I can say about this matter; but the House is aware that the Government of India does not favour the introduction of a passport system on the ground that it would restrict traffic between East

Pakistan and India. In fact, the Agreement concluded between the Prime Ministers of the two countries two and a half years ago sought to limit the volume of this traffic at its normal level. If Pakistan, however, introduces some kind of a passport system on the other side, we will have to take similar measures to deal with the situation. It is true that the minorities in East Bengal have had a very raw deal and continue to have a raw deal. The sympathy of this House and that of a large number of people in this country is with them. We have tried to help them as much as we can and we shall continue to do so. There are, however, certain limits to what we can do. Two independent countries, in their mutual dealings, can bring pressure to bear on each other through diplomatic means. There are also other means of doing so but we do not wish to have recourse to them for they can only bring misery.

I now wish to say a few words on the question of linguistic provinces although we have explained our attitude to this problem repeatedly. Quite frankly I feel that the formation of linguistic provinces is desirable from certain points of view. Our views on the subject are, however, immaterial. For, if the people want them, they will have them and we shall not stand in their way. For some years now, our foremost efforts have been directed to the consolidation of India. Personally, I would look upon anything that did not help this process of consolidation as undesirable. Even though the formation of linguistic provinces may be advisable, in some cases, this would obviously be the wrong time for it. When the right time comes, let us have them by all means. Further, we have laid down the rule that there should be a large measure of agreement between the States affected by this measure, before linguistic provinces can be formed. The redistribution of boundaries which becomes necessary in such cases inevitably involves the interest of rival groups and States. Besides, financial and other considerations also arise and it is found that the redistribution cannot be effected without retarding the economic progress of the region concerned and even that of the country at large. We have sometimes been asked to impose our decision upon one or all of

the parties and achieve something at the point of the bayonet. I think this attitude is completely wrong. If a large measure of agreement can be secured, we can form such provinces, although we would like this to be done without any untoward consequences.

I attach the greatest importance to the subject of the tribal people which I shall deal with next. In Assam and elsewhere they have suffered greatly by the Partition. The legacies left by the latter are still with us and many, who were deprived of their means of livelihood at the time of Partition, are still without employment. This happened because they were cut off from neighbouring areas and this state of affairs cannot be remedied unless these regions are adequately connected with the rest of the country; but to build roads on mountainous tracks is very expensive. We have already built a number of such roads and we are building more. In about a fortnight from now, a conference will be held to consider matters relating to the welfare of the tribal people.

The hon. Member from Manipur has raised the question of compensation for the damage caused by the war in his constituency. I do not know the details. It should normally be the duty of the British Government to pay compensation for this damage. We have, however, undertaken to discharge this liability to some extent in this area and, I believe, we have already paid between Rs. 25 and 30 lakhs as compensation. Obviously, I cannot, without looking into the matter closely, assure you that the payment of compensation has been made fairly. A few Claims Officers have been appointed and the payments are being made in consultation with the local bodies. The process is still going on and claims are still being considered.

The hon. Member from Travancore referred to our policy in regard to the production and export of monazite. Until recently, large quantities of monazite used to be sold almost for a song. It suddenly became a highly strategic and, therefore, valuable mineral. For a variety of reasons, we have stopped its export, although some of it still continues to be exported under licence. The material is not quite as expensive as the hon. Member thought; he said it cost £250 per ton.

The price in America, at present, is half that figure. We have, as a matter of fact, built a factory at Alwaye to separate monazite from ilmenite and other rare earths. I have no doubt that this factory will be of great advantage to the State of Travancore and India. We decided sometime ago that no material used in the manufacture of atomic bombs should be exported from India. But we do not wish to forbid the export of monazite where it is put to other uses. We determine the volume of exports in terms of the foreign exchange we can earn from them.

Much has been said about Kashmir. Dr Mookerjee raised a question about Kashmir's constitutional status and he wanted to know if Kashmiris were Indians. Of course, they are Indians, constitutionally and legally. If they want to go abroad, they must have an Indian passport. When the question of the merger of the States was first considered, four or five years ago, almost all the States acceded in three subjects only—foreign affairs, defence and communications. A little later, when there was a raid on Kashmir, it also acceded in respect of three subjects. There were further developments in the other States and they acceded in some additional subjects. During this period, we have had a conflict with Pakistan in regard to Kashmir because of the raids and the war. The matter has been referred to the United Nations. Therefore, it is not desired that any more changes should take place in the status of Kashmir in relation to India during this period of turmoil. Kashmir has acceded in the basic subjects and is a part of India. So far as other subjects are concerned, obviously the people of Kashmir have or rather their Constituent Assembly has every right to pass any laws it chooses. This is the constitutional position and it is quite clear as far as I can see. At the moment, matters, such as the financial integration of Kashmir with India, are under discussion and I have no doubt that they will gradually be solved. The fact that such questions have always to be viewed in their international background creates great difficulties.

Finally, I would like to speak to you about the rehabilitation of refugees. We are deeply conscious that a large number of refugees, especially those coming from East

Bengal, require to be rehabilitated; but, taking the problem as a whole, I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that our achievements in the field of rehabilitation have been remarkable. Of course, ours is not the only country that has had to undertake large-scale rehabilitation of refugees. The United Nations have spent considerable sums of money for a similar purpose all over the world. Other countries have faced the same problems but the rehabilitation experts from abroad have invariably expressed, in no uncertain manner, their admiration for our achievements. I should like the House to remember that we have accomplished the task of rehabilitation without the least financial or other help from abroad or from the United Nations. The whole burden has been ours and we have borne it well. I must say that we could not have succeeded if large numbers of the displaced persons themselves had not co-operated with us in this task, played their part and done their share of the work. They showed amazing enterprise and courage in building themselves up anew. The great tragedy of the migrations turned into a sign of hope for us, for it showed us that ultimately our people can face tragedy and overcome it.

LINGUISTIC STATES

I ENTIRELY agree with Dr Lanka Sundaram who said right at the beginning that we should keep away from passion and prejudice. Dr Mookerjee said that the question of linguistic States should not be considered a party matter. I agree to some extent but I sometimes feel that perhaps it would have been better if it were a party matter. I shall explain myself. It is not that I want things to become party matters but a party matter, at any rate, does cut across provincial feelings. It may be good or bad but a party would not consider any question on a provincial basis. Well, this particular question

is, in the very nature of things, a provincial one. When there is division or friction between representatives of different provinces, I think it is much worse than any party divisions.

An hon. Member—one of the noted poets we have in this House—referred to the old British policy of divide and rule. He seemed to hint that in the matter of linguistic provinces, the policy of the present Government is a continuation of that policy. Whatever one's views on this question may be, I must confess that I fail to understand how our policy can be construed as one of divide and rule.

Repeated references have been made to the policy the Congress adopted for a number of years. An hon. Member said that I used to go around shouting about linguistic provinces from the house tops and at street corners. I am not aware of having done so at all. In fact, I have never been very enthusiastic about linguistic provinces. My views on our provinces are peculiar. Coming, as I do, from the biggest of India's provinces, I feel that provinces in this country should be much smaller than they are. It is not necessary to have the whole paraphernalia of a Governor, a High Court and so on for every province. But mine was a lone voice even when the Constituent Assembly was considering this matter. We were so used to existing conditions that we were satisfied to let things continue as they were.

Everybody knows that about thirty years ago the Congress stood for linguistic provinces. Seven years ago, the Congress, in its election manifesto of 1945-1946, said: "It (the Congress) has also stood for the freedom of each group and territorial area within the nation to develop its own life and culture within the larger framework and it is stated that for this purpose such territorial areas or provinces should be constituted, as far as possible, on a linguistic and cultural basis."

The latest position is embodied in the election manifesto of the last General Election drawn up at Bangalore. I shall, if I may, read that out: "The demand for a redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis has been persistently made in the South and West of India. The Congress expressed itself in favour of linguistic provinces many years ago. A decision

on this question ultimately depends upon the wishes of the people concerned. While linguistic reasons have undoubtedly a certain cultural and other importance, there are other factors also, such as economic, administrative and financial, which have to be taken into consideration. Where such a demand represents the agreed views of the people concerned, the necessary steps prescribed by the Constitution, including the appointment of a Boundary Commission, should be taken."

That more or less represents the policy and the position of Government in this matter.

In regard to the Andhra province, for instance, hon. Members have suggested a plebiscite. I entirely agree that 95 to 97 per cent of the people concerned would vote for it. But that does not solve my difficulties. I am all in favour of the Andhra province. But what will happen if you take the votes of the Andhras and the Tamilians and others in a controversial place like Madras city? Then you won't get 90 per cent this way or that. It is quite obvious that the Andhras will vote *en bloc* for the Andhra province on principle; and rightly so. Similarly, if you take the votes of large numbers of our friends on the Karnataka question they will vote for the Karnataka province. I have no doubt about that. That goes for the Maharashtrians too. If they did not or if it was expected that they would not vote in this manner, the question of our discussion would not arise. So, we proceed on the assumption that considerable numbers of people in certain areas desire linguistic provinces. That is perhaps too limited a phrase. What they really want is a province where their language, more or less, prevails.

Speaking for myself, I have been overburdened with the thought that we must give the topmost priority to the development of a sense of unity in India because these are critical days. Any decision that might come in the way of that unity should be delayed till we have laid a strong foundation for it. Because of that, I for my own part have frankly—and I should be quite frank with this House—not taken any aggressive or positive step in regard to the formation of linguistic provinces. Although I agreed with the demand, I

left it at that in many cases. If there is general consent, well and good. We will form an Andhra province and are prepared to do so. Towards the end of 1949 we had practically decided to have an Andhra province, because most matters had been settled by the Tamil people, the Andhras and others concerned. I think a specially formed Committee and the Local Government had worked together for the settlement of these matters. However, we suddenly found that two or three very vital matters were not settled. We as a government were perfectly agreeable to a separate Andhra State. But nothing could be done about it as conflicts arose at the last moment. So, for the last two and a half years or so we have been on the verge of finalizing matters but something or the other kept happening, outside our competence to delay it. I have no doubt at all in my mind—taking an individual case like the Andhra province—that there is a great deal of justification for it. It is bound to come and I am sure that the Andhras want it. And that really is the final justification for it.

But when we get into difficulties about the city of Madras or Rayalaseema—and I am not mentioning this just to create difficulties—what are we to do? We can only follow one of the two courses. The first is to create a better atmosphere and try to encourage a settlement by consent. The other is to come down with a heavy hand and overrule this party or that and lay down our own terms. The second can be done. Governments have done it. But hon. Members will, no doubt, realize that in a matter of this kind strong feelings are roused. If we were to make a new province by some coercive method, we would be leaving behind a trail of intense bitterness between the two provinces that used to be one and were forcibly divided. It would not be good for either of them to start with an inheritance of ill-will and bitterness against their neighbours just when they are starting from scratch and have to settle down to build themselves anew. Therefore, it is infinitely better, even though it takes a little more time, to form linguistic provinces only when the goodwill and consent of all concerned are forthcoming.

That was our general approach. And I submit that it is the right approach, because it will ultimately save more

time than trying to rush things in a manner which might entangle us in long arguments for years. After all, even the simplest of partitions brings with it problems and all kinds of difficulties, administrative, financial and other. The separation of Burma was, of course, very different. It was complete in every way and had our goodwill. There was no conflict in it. Still, it took ten years or so to work itself out and the process is not quite complete even today. The other terrible partitions in this country have undoubtedly made many of us hesitant about changing the map of India. I admit that it is necessary in some cases and, where it is necessary, let us change it by all means. But the resolution that has been put forward seems to me completely unacceptable and, as it is worded, quite objectionable. It is all very well for our friends from Andhra or Maharashtra or Kerala or Karnataka to put forward a definite proposal which could be considered and then accepted or rejected. But a general proposition saying, 'Let us take the map of India and let us re-shape and cut it up anew on the basis of language,' is one which I submit no reasonable person can support. It means upsetting what you have and unsettling everything just when you are more or less settling down somehow or other. It would be dangerous at any time but it is more so at a time when the world is on the verge of a crisis. One does not know what tomorrow or the day after might bring. For us to unsettle and uproot the whole of India on the basis of a theoretical approach or linguistic division seems to me an extraordinarily unwise thing.

India has a magnificent inheritance. We, of course, want to better that inheritance and to advance it. In doing so, we sometimes think too parochially or provincially. I do not say that one should never think of one's own parish or province but it is dangerous to have a parochial attitude to India as a whole. To my mind, this resolution seeks to transfer the parochial and provincial outlook to the whole of India and, as such, I cannot support it.

My honourable friend, Dr Syama Prasad Mookerjee, spoke eloquently of West Bengal. I am sure every Member in this House is aware that West Bengal has to shoulder

tremendous burdens as a result of the Partition and other matters connected with it. I have no doubt that no other State in India suffered so much. The argument advanced by Dr Mookerjee was that some adjoining areas should be added on to West Bengal because it had a heavy population. Now, I am not giving an opinion. Logically or theoretically speaking, that seems to be a valid argument. But you cannot always be logical in these matters. I am quite sure that Members from Bihar do not wholly approve of what Dr Mookerjee has said, regardless of what party they belong to. I shall not go into the question as to who is right.

Two or three months ago, I was in the Darjeeling area of North Bengal and there was a deputation from the Gurkha League demanding a Gurkha or Nepali province in North Bengal. Now, I am quite sure Dr Mookerjee does not approve of that. It means taking away something from the already restricted Bengal. I might inform the House of my own reactions to it. But, instead of using my own words, I shall read out something that Sardar Patel said in the House and with which I entirely agree. When the question of the Gurkha province or Uttarkhand came up, his answer was: "The Government of India consider this move of Uttarkhand in North Bengal as unreal, misconceived and harmful to national interests. The Government of India are determined not to give any quarter to any agitation for the formation of any such province and will not allow the solidarity of the country to be disturbed by such mischievous moves."

In this matter, Dr Mookerjee and I are in complete agreement. My point is this: if Dr Mookerjee raised the question of redistribution of provinces round Bengal, similar questions will crop up not only in the west but in the north too. One cannot envisage what will ultimately emerge from the boiling cauldron of redistribution all over India.

It is all very well to say, 'Decide this question this way or that way; do not leave it undecided.' I can understand such an attitude in regard to a specific matter. But I do not understand how a question as general as redistribution can be decided this way or that. In fact, such things are normally not decided this way or that way. You may lay down some

general principles if you like but even principles can clash. There is the principle of linguistic provinces. There is the principle of economic self-sufficiency and there are financial considerations. All these have to be balanced before a particular decision in a particular place can be taken. Normally, no single general principle should indiscriminately be applied to a whole country. The present geographical structure of India has changed very greatly in the last three or four years. First of all, the Partition took away a considerable part of India. The picture changed still further by the merger of a large number of the old Indian States. Nevertheless, the old provinces of India, roughly speaking, remain more or less the same. That does not mean that they should not change. Certainly, they may change but you should start with the basis that you will not upset the *status quo*. If a particular demand is considered reasonable, you can give effect to it. But to say that you should give effect to a particular principle all over India has no meaning.

In regard to countries like India and China, there is always difficulty about provincialism. They are huge countries and inevitably the various parts of the country differ from one another—sometimes in language, sometimes in the way of living and in many other things. In China they have some great advantages over us. They have, at any rate, one written language for the whole country although the spoken language differs. Both India and China have always had to contend against provincialism. I do not know enough about the past history or the recent history of China to be able to give details as to how they have dealt with this question. But, generally speaking, they have tried to get over provincialism by getting rid of the provinces themselves. I believe that, besides the two or three autonomous areas like Inner Mongolia and Tibet, China has been divided into zones which presumably cut across the old provincial boundaries. I merely mention this because the problem, in regard to the provinces and their size, is much the same here. The idea of linguistic provinces will intensify provincial feelings and that, undoubtedly, will weaken the concept of a united India. That is one aspect.

Another equally important aspect is that we have certain very important languages in India. A language by itself may be good or bad; but round that language are clustered certain ways of living and sometimes ways of thought. It is but right that this particular aspect of cultural manifestation should have an opportunity for full growth.

As far as languages are concerned, I think that we should encourage all the hill dialects of India. I am not in favour of suppressing any language and the major languages must certainly go ahead. The best way to encourage the growth of a people is through the language they speak and every State should recognize that; if the State is multilingual, it should encourage all the different languages, whatever they are. I do not quite see why the political boundary should necessarily be a linguistic one. If several languages are spoken in any particular region, they can all have an opportunity to develop. I feel that behind the demand for linguistic provinces there lies something a little more difficult to deal with than the problem of languages. That something is a feeling on the part of the people who make the demand that they have not had a square deal, that if they were left alone to manage their affairs they would see that they got it. I cannot say whether there is much justification for the existence of such a feeling but the fact that it exists is not good for us. If we still function in a narrow, provincial way, reserving one group for our favours to the exclusion of another, it is unfortunate. It means that, however big we may talk, we are still limited in our outlook and do not think or function in a national way. Having admitted that, we must try to get over it. I should have thought that a multilingual State like Bombay or Madras afforded greater opportunities for growth and for developing a wider outlook than the big leviathan of a State like Uttar Pradesh. You will find in history and elsewhere that in some countries, small States are forced to think in large terms. They are forced to learn the languages of other States. Because people living in huge States and countries become so complacent that they do not think of people elsewhere. I do not know why people attach so much importance to the greatness of

size. I suppose their preference for large areas is a relic of the old days when a man's income was proportionate to the size of the land he owned. A large size does not necessarily imply growth in any sense, even though we seem to think so. I, for my part, would be perfectly agreeable if there were a proposition that Uttar Pradesh, for instance, be split up into four provinces. However, I doubt very much if my colleagues from Uttar Pradesh would relish that idea; on the contrary, they would probably like to have an additional chunk from some other province.

Some hon. Members thought it desirable that Hyderabad should be split up into smaller units. I think such a step would be injurious to Hyderabad and would upset the whole structure of South India. It would be very unwise to do anything that would destroy the administrative continuity that has been achieved in Hyderabad after so much effort.

We are perfectly prepared to accede to the very justifiable demands in South India. Of course, we are not going to re-shape India on a linguistic basis. We are, however, willing to look into specific issues but we cannot expect that there will be absolute unanimity in regard to them. Dr Lanka Sundaram said that no Andhra would ever relinquish his claim to the city of Madras. I am sure that people from the Tamil areas will assert something to the contrary with equal vehemence. Let the two come together and arrive at a settlement. I do not suggest that we remain passive in this matter. I am prepared to do all I can to help in a settlement but I do not see how I can go with a flashing sword to the Tamils or the Andhras and say, 'You must submit to the other's demand.' Even if I did that, the results would not be good because I would leave a trail of bitter memories behind. We talk of Vishala Andhra, of Maha Gujarat, of the Samyukth Maharashtra and so on. A map will show that they all overlap and presage conflict. So long as you are discussing the principle of it, many people from Maha Gujarat will vote for Vishala Andhra and so on. But as soon as they look at the maps, there will be strife everywhere. Ancient history will be quoted: 'In the year 1,000 A.D. or something like that, Maha Gujarat spread right up to there'

or 'the Maharashtra Empire was up to here at the time of the Rashtrakutas.' In their day, these ancient empires were imperial entities constantly at war in order to conquer territory. Any talk of historical parallels inflames provincial sentiment and inevitably leads to a desire on the part of the State concerned to dominate over the neighbouring territory.

No agitation is necessary to convince me that the Andhra claim is justified. I am already convinced. If you are an Andhra, you must reason with the Tamilians and others concerned. I will participate in the talks if necessary. If, on the other hand, a similar demand is made in the case of Uttarkhand, I would strongly oppose it; I would also oppose a Sikh province. I am not going to play about with our frontiers in the north. But claims like those of Andhra or Karnataka or Kerala or Maharashtra have my concurrence. The odd thing is that the more agitation there is, the more rigid the contending parties become. The only way to settle disputes about linguistic provinces is to consider them in a spirit of goodwill. A plebiscite, supposing that the States concerned agreed to it, would not necessarily solve everything. If a party wins by a narrow margin—and this is bound to happen in most cases—a good deal of bitterness will be created.

Professor Saha referred to the separate republics in the Soviet Union in support of the theory of linguistic provinces in India. The two are not really comparable, because India is much more of a unity than the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is no longer a single empire but the union of a number of entirely different countries. They have formed a political unit and are happy about it. That is very good. They proceeded on the basis of independent republics federating together. Now, India cannot function on that basis. As I said, we are a much more unified country. If you consider Russia—not the Soviet Union—which is more of a unified country, in relation to India, it will be a better comparison. Large tracts of Asia, which belong to the Soviet Union, have been added to Russia and they follow a common policy. Even so, the practice, as a matter of fact, is really somewhat different from the theory—I mean the

theory of secession. I think it is perfectly clear that no part of the Soviet Union can secede at all. Thus, in spite of the theoretical right of secession of the component parts, the process of centralization has gone pretty far in the Soviet Union.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND PLANNING

THE MIDDLE WAY

IT HAS BEEN a great pleasure to me to come here. I have done so chiefly because my old friend Dr Hamied invited me and also because I consider that the chemical industry is a very important one. I have also come on a mission of curiosity and intend to find out who the chemical manufacturers of this country are and what they are doing. I have learnt something from Dr Hamied's address. Of course, I do not mean to say that I was totally unaware of their activities. Dr Hamied's address added a great deal to my knowledge of what has been done or not done and also what the Government should and should not do. He has presumably asked me and others to appreciate and admire the work of both the chemical manufacturers and the other private interests engaged in industry in India.

I have no doubt that much of their work is worthy of appreciation and occasionally some might even be worthy of admiration. Perhaps, it might be said that they have not yet attained the degree of perfection at which we aim and there might be some lapses on their part. We have, nevertheless, to look at this problem in relation to our country's economy and her needs. We have to keep before us the problem of how to build or develop our economy and, in a smaller sense, our chemical industry as well.

Looking at newspaper advertisements it seemed to me that one of the main industries in the country was the manufacture of some potent and powerful pills. Being unacquainted with the taste or effect of those pills and seeing the advertisements in the newspapers day after day, I began to dislike intensely the people who manufactured these things and advertised them so frequently. I may go a

step further and say that I am a very bad product of the pharmaceutical age, because I have hardly ever taken any medicine, pills or drugs. However, I have no doubt that other people need these pills and I have no desire to deprive them.

Dr Hamied has referred to some large questions. He has laid down some excellent maxims and some extraordinary maxims. He has stated as an obvious fact which admits of no dispute or argument that private enterprise and nationalization can be equated with democracy and that totalitarianism and nationalization are the same. It is for the first time that I have heard such a viewpoint. I am not going to enter into any controversy about this or about what he called the dual policy of the Government. Obviously, he wants us either to plump for absolute free enterprise or for hundred per cent nationalization.

I am afraid Dr Hamied is out of touch with what is happening in the world. There is no country in the world where the free enterprise of his dream exists. It does not exist even in the United States of America which is the high-priest of free enterprise. On the contrary, it becomes less and less significant in spite of the country's policy and its aims. World conditions today create forces which compel a country to progress in a certain direction, whether it wants to or not.

There are countries like Soviet Russia and some others which have gone a long way in creating a State which is in complete control of industry. Everything else is also State-controlled. Dr Hamied wants us to choose between Soviet Russia and something which does not exist anywhere in the world. That is a very hard choice indeed and I do not see why I should be forced to make it. It is inevitable that those countries, which do not want either of the two extremes, must find a middle way. In that middle way, there is bound to be more emphasis on some factors than on others but obviously a middle way or a mixed economy, if you like to call it that, is inevitable. That is not a dogma or an axiom which can be applied to any country regardless of its conditions. It will have to be decided by each country individually with regard to its particular conditions. What may be suit-

able for India might not be suitable, let us say, for Burma or Afghanistan or a country in Europe. We have to base our actions on objective facts and our capacities. We cannot think of this country in terms of what is happening in the United States. We must take into consideration the facts that are peculiar to and govern the situation.

The United States of America has had 150 years of consolidation and growth and its capacity for production today is colossal. All kinds of economic forces which have little relationship with the old idea of capitalism are active in that country. Of course, America is a capitalist country and she is proud of being one. But the fact is that modern capitalism in the United States of America is vastly different from what it was twenty or thirty or forty years ago. It has changed. Even economies can move in a particular direction with a momentum of their own. I was told the other day by some one who knows—I have no idea how far the figures are correct—that one person in every five in the United States of America is in some kind of State employment. That is a prodigious number and America, mind you, is a capitalist and not a socialist State. The fact that one person in five is in State employment in a capitalist country shows how the nature of the capitalist State is changing. This means that in a country where conditions are different and where the stresses of modern life are greater, the changes are also bound to be of a basic nature.

In England there has also been a considerable change. I should like to know what the response from Parliament or from the Government or from other people would be if Dr Hamied's axiom were to be stated in England. England is obviously pursuing a socialist policy and has been pursuing it with considerable courage during the last four or five years since the war ended.

So, the problem is not a simple one. There are in this world various policies, ideologies and theories. I suppose there is some truth in each of them. However, my personal feeling is that while it is very important to have a theory as the logical basis of our thought, it is not reasonable to apply it by force to all conditions. We can use a theory for the pur-

pose of argument and for testing its validity. In practice, however, you have to take the facts of the situation and adapt either yourself or your theory accordingly. Most countries have to do it. If I may say so, even Soviet Russia which seeks to base herself on a very hard and rigid theory of Marxism, interprets Marxism in a manner that suits her. The result is that her brand of Marxism has little to do with Marx. I am quite certain that Marx would be astonished if he were to see the various interpretations of his theory. Whether you approve of this or not is immaterial. The important point is that Russians, in their own way, are hard realists and continue to adapt their policy to what they consider for the moment good for their country or their party.

Coming to India, we have to consider things as they are. We cannot lay down any slogan or watchword and try to force it through to its logical conclusion. Whether it is in India or anywhere else, only those policies can succeed which promise to deliver the goods. There are no other tests. Broadly speaking, the present conflict is between the various forces represented by communism on the one side and on the other by something to which I cannot quite give a name. I cannot call it capitalism because it has all kinds of variations. What is really developing in the world is some kind of democratic socialism. It is developing gradually and in varying degrees. Whatever the two conflicting forces may be, their real test is not going to be on the battlefield. They are ultimately going to be tested by the results achieved.

We should try to understand our problems in as realistic a manner as possible, avoiding for the moment words which have long histories behind them and which confuse the mind. When we throw these 'isms' about as arguments, we get lost. Passions are aroused and the hard facts are ignored. A person who calls himself a socialist naturally has a certain general outlook and a certain set of objectives. Another person may have quite a different point of view. If you put these two persons together, they hurl harsh words at each other and nothing results. If, on the other hand, they sat down together and said, 'Well, here is a job to be done,' something might result. Here in India, there is so much we want—food, cloth-

ing, housing, education, health—in fact, all the important things of life. How are we to get them? Surely, not by shouting slogans or passing resolutions about socialism or capitalism or any other 'ism'. We will have to produce the goods and distribute them properly. We must think how best to do it.

There is no doubt that American capitalism has an amazing capacity for production; in fact, it is colossal. This capacity of American capitalism was not always the same; it has changed and has been changing. Besides, the United States of America has had 150 years to achieve it in. It has a territory with huge economic resources. It had opportunity without the hampering background of conflict which other countries had to reckon with. It had neither a heavy population nor the relics of a feudal age. It was a new country with enormous space and it developed to its present level in 150 years. It is thus rather absurd to say, 'Do what has been done in America.' I would like to do it in my own way but how can I do it? I do not have the 150 years or even 100 years to settle down in and grow as America did. I have neither that enormous space nor that invaluable freedom from conflict and trouble. I have neither that much time nor the same opportunity. India is a big country with a background of all kinds of conflict. Many kinds of forces are at play. I have got to solve my problems in the immediate present or in the near future, not in the next hundred years. Private enterprise in America developed gradually till it built up for itself a very strong position with enormous resources. Has private enterprise in India got the capacity or the ability or the resources to do that? It has ability and it has resources but it just has not the strength or capacity to solve the situation by itself. It is a patent fact that you just cannot do it. Is our private enterprise going to take up our river valley schemes? It cannot, because they are too big for it. These schemes cannot pay dividends quickly. We have to wait for years and years. Therefore, the State inevitably has to take them up. In America the railways are owned by private companies. Here we own the railways. Are we not told, 'All this dislocates business. Let private enterprise have

full play? If private enterprise has full play, one of the first casualties in this country will be private enterprise itself. To be frank with you—I am talking in general terms—private enterprise in this country is not wise enough. It may be clever in making money but it just is not wise enough. It does not see what is happening all round. It does not see a changing world in turmoil but sees it in terms of an age that is dead and gone.

It so happens—and it amazes me—that here in India, in spite of enormous difficulties, we have conflicts and all kinds of unhelpful criticism and condemnation of the Government. That very fact symbolizes a certain state of affairs in India and an attitude in the minds of her people which is far from critical. There is no doubt about it. When we talk of something critical like the food situation, for instance, we use strong language without showing any awareness of the crisis. We live our lives in the same old way and though large numbers of people suffer in the country for lack of food, lack of shelter or lack of other things, most of us, especially those of us who criticize, lead our lives unaffected in any way. Asia is on the verge of a crisis. In fact, the whole world is tense with a sense of urgency but we have no such sense yet! Unfortunately, this lightheartedness in understanding what is happening all round us is not good because then realization sometimes comes as a shock. We have to take the problems of India and look at them in the context of the world. Let us deal with them as realistically as possible, having certain aims and objectives, trying to go towards them, adopting our policies with a view to realizing those objectives, without arguing so much and without having recourse to slogans or set terms.

The only objective that you can set before you in the modern world is a widespread raising of the people's standard of living. It is not the only objective but others are subject to it. No government can afford to ignore the urges of the common people. After all, democracy has its basis on those very urges and if any government flouts them, it is pushed aside and other governments take over. They may be better or worse. That is immaterial.

Dr Hamied, in his address, criticized heavy taxation on the one hand and on the other called upon the Government to provide certain urgently needed things like a synthetic petrol plant which would cost thirty or forty crores. How can we reduce the revenue by lessening the taxes and still do everything that is necessary? I don't understand. Naturally, there is a limit to our capacity to do things and there is a limit to taxation. We cannot go beyond that without disturbing the whole structure of our economy. Important things have certainly to be done and if enough money is not forthcoming, those things are not done.

I should like you, gentlemen, to look at this picture and balance things. I want you to realize that in the modern age it is not possible to go back to the old days of a dead world. No country in the wide world can go back to those days. If you think in terms of going back then you are thinking in a vacuum and that is unreal thinking. How far the State can or should come in or how far there should be co-operation are matters for consideration but the real test is results which are not the accumulation of private fortunes but the advancement of the public generally.

COMMUNITY PROJECTS

IT ALL depends on how you and I and all of us approach the question. Is it just another of our many schemes—good schemes, no doubt—in which we shall do our day's work and leave the rest to chance or is it something more than that? Is it something which you will direct from above as an administrator, as Development Commissioners, as a Central Committee or as the Planning Commission and so on, or is it something which will enable you to unleash forces from below among our people to do the work? Forces unleashed without definite aims and without proper co-ordination sometimes yield good results and sometimes bad. A

good lead and a good organization from the top is obviously necessary and essential, yet it may be completely useless unless the forces from below are released.

Sometimes, I begin to suspect and become a little afraid of these leads from the top that we, including myself, are always giving. We have got into the habit of doling out good advice to the country, to our people, to everybody. Nevertheless, my own experience has shown that people who give too much advice are unpopular. They are irritating. At any rate such advice does not conduce to the good of others, as it is intended to. That is to say, if we act too much from the top without adequate foundations and without that intimate relation with the lower rungs, we can hardly achieve any great results. We will achieve something, of course. So the problem becomes one of how to bring about a union of these two elements.

Obviously, it is necessary to plan, to direct, to organize and to co-ordinate; but it is even more necessary to create conditions in which a spontaneous growth from below is possible. I wonder if this Community Scheme is something which is likely to bring about a union between the top and the others. By the term top I do not mean that some people are superior; I mean those who guide, the organizers; and by others I mean the millions who will participate in the work. In fact, ultimately there should be no top and no gradations. Nevertheless, I feel that even the organizational lead should not be tossed like a ball from what is the top to what might, if you like, be called the bottom; that is to say, even the initiative for the Community Projects should come, wherever possible, from the people who are most affected by them.

Often, we like to sit in our chambers and decide everything according to what we consider to be good for the people. I think the people themselves should be given the opportunity to think about it and thus they will affect our thinking as we affect their thinking. In this way, something much more living and integrated is produced, something in which there is a sense of intimate partnership—intimate partnership not in the doing of the job but in the making of the job and the thinking of the job. It is true that those of us

or those of you who are more trained, who have given more thought to the problem and might be considered, to some extent, especially suited to that kind of work are better qualified for thinking and giving the lead than you or I; at the same time, it is equally true that unless those, who may not be specialists but for whom you are working and who ultimately are supposed to work for themselves, feel that mental urge, that impact of the creative spirit within them to think and act, they will not work in the way that we all want them to work.

I do consider that the scheme of Community Projects is something of very great importance and it is so not merely because you can sum up and write down on paper the material achievements of such a project, which I hope will be considerable—all the additional food grown, the houses built, schools and dispensaries, better roads, tanks, wells and so on. You can make a list of them and it is pleasing to see that list but somehow my mind goes beyond to the man, woman and child. The house may be good but it is the builder of the house that counts ultimately, not the house or even the occupant of the house. Therefore, it is to the builder that my mind goes; we want to make the people of India all builders. These Community Projects appear to me to be something of vital importance, not only in the material achievements that they would bring about but much more so because they seek to build up the community and the individual and to make the latter a builder of his own village centre and of India in the larger sense.

Now, how are you going to proceed? Naturally, not by vague talk and discussion. One cannot have those plans without a very great deal of careful discussion and I am glad to say that there has been a good deal of these discussions in the last two or three months and they have borne some fruit already. Yet a slight fear seizes me when I see all this planning and organization that, perhaps, we might begin to think that this is the major part of our work. That is, we might begin to think, as many of us are apt to do, that, sitting in big buildings and big offices, it is we who are doing the job. We are doing nothing of the kind. We are only indicat-

ing how the job is to be done; it is the others who will have to do it. But, somehow, as things are, the persons who do the job are rather diffident. How to give the initiative to the people in these things? How to invest them with that sense of partnership, that sense of purpose, that eagerness to do things?

Looking into my own mind and trying to revive old memories, I remember how at some periods of our existence, individual and national, we did think that way, we did feel that way and act that way. It is this sense which adds to one's stature. Although that kind of thing has happened in this country, whether anything similar can happen again in our life-time, I do not know. We may not achieve our former standard because conditions are different. Anyhow, I am of a generation that belongs more or less to the past and cannot, therefore, speak for others—the younger generation, who ought to feel as we did. Whether we feel that way or not, it seems to me quite obvious that if the tremendous task of re-building India is undertaken, it will have to be undertaken with something much more than the books and statistics, papers and directions and planning and organization that we may put into it. It will have to be undertaken with something fiery and with the spirit that moves a nation to high endeavour. Well, can the Community Projects be looked at that way? Perhaps, I am putting it too high and it is dangerous to put a thing too high, because if you do so you are liable to react the other way.

I suppose there is hardly a country—and I mean no disrespect to other countries—which has such high ideals as India. And I may add that there is hardly a country where the gap between ideals and performance is so big as in India. So, it is a dangerous thing to talk big and then not be able to come anywhere near your objective. Nevertheless, occasionally one has even to gaze at the stars even though one may not reach them. Merely to lower your ideals because you think they are too high is not right, even though you might not quite achieve these ideals. How far can we take the Community Projects out of the setting of your offices and make them a scheme for living men and women inspired

by something worth while to do? That is the problem. We measure and calculate rightly and inevitably about the finances and the resources involved; one has got to do it, one cannot act irresponsibly. However, if I may say so, all these are secondary matters. The primary matter is the human being involved, the man who is going to work, the man who is going to feel it and translate that feeling into action. Are you going to try to create that type of human being? The human being is there, of course: you have only to reach his heart and mind. You can do that but not by doling out advice. Take it from me, do not advise too much: do the job yourself. That is the only advice you can give to others. Do it and others will follow. Why do you think, it is your business to sit in a big office and issue orders because you are the Development Commissioner? If I may say so with all respect, you are no good if you do that. Better go somewhere else and do some other job. Let us be clear about this.

Whether it is the Development Commissioner or the Administrator, he must not sit in his office and issue decrees all the time. He must take the spade and dig or do something else. No man connected with the scheme, who merely sits in his office, is good enough, as far as I am concerned. If you work, you will make others work. That is the only way of giving a lead and calling upon others to work. We are becoming a lazy people, especially with your hands and feet and often enough intellectually lazy, too. I regret to say, although it has nothing to do with our present work here, that our university standards are going down and, if this is not checked, I do not know how we are to make good in anything big later. However, that is another matter.

Wherever you are, I expect that you should begin your work every morning with a little manual effort, if possible, in furtherance of the Community Projects. You must develop a sense of partnership.

I do not know what our Development Commissioner or the Administrator has done thus far in regard to the production of leaflets, pamphlets, etc., explaining the schemes. I have seen a pamphlet here. It is in English. It is rather businesslike and good. I hope that such pamphlets will be

issued in the various languages of India. But much more is required. I want this matter to be explained, not in this businesslike way but in a more human way, so that somehow it may catch the imagination of the people concerned. But what is more necessary is that you, the Development Commissioners, should function in a human way with the people, should talk to them in a friendly way, get to know what they want and explain to them what you propose to do, how it is their work, how it is not something imposed upon them and not even something that is a gift from above. You should explain to them that it is going to be a project of co-operative endeavour, how they will benefit by it and their children and their children's children. See that you get to know them somehow, reach their minds and hearts and invite them to work with you; not under your command but with you, so that you gradually form some kind of brotherhood, a fraternity of workers.

I speak, naturally, with some knowledge of my people. I am not afraid of criticizing my people. I have just called them lazy and all that. And yet I do believe quite honestly that the human material we have in India is very fine and, given the opportunity, it can achieve big things. How to give an opportunity to this vast mass of human material—that is the problem. You cannot suddenly give it to all, however much you may plan for it. Of course, you must plan for everybody. No planning which is not for all is good enough. You must always have that view before you and you must prepare the foundations for the next step towards the final goal. And so, you ultimately start a process which grows by itself. Suppose you take fifty-five Community Projects today; you plan next year to take another hundred or whatever the number and so on. You want the number to grow so that in the course of five or six years you may have from 500 to 600 or more centres.

That itself is a tremendous thing covering, as it possibly will, a very large proportion of our population. I was thinking of something slightly different in addition. Take a centre in one place comprising about a hundred villages; what you do there in a concentrated way will percolate through to the

surrounding villages. If the work is too officialized, this will not happen. It will never spread beyond your immediate vision. It must not become something too rigid but be something which has an element of spontaneous growth within it. And that can only happen when you catch the imagination of the people. Then it grows automatically. There is always a danger—I am myself guilty of it often enough—that by direction and authority we may make a thing rigid, not flexible, making it a part of the official hierarchy. Now, official hierarchies are, I suppose, necessary. But with all the good they do, they have a certain deadening influence on anything that is spontaneous or vital. Community Projects will never grow if they are approached in that way. You must always think of the element of spontaneity.

This kind of project will succeed or fail in the measure that you achieve results within stated periods. There is, of course, a certain amount of vagueness when you approach the people but there must be precision about one thing: about the time in which a thing must be done. That target must be continually before you. And if you do not reach it, well, you fail to that extent.

Really, what we are committed to is not a few community centres but to working for the biggest community of all and that is the community of the people of India, more especially those who are down and out, those who are backward. There are far too many backward people in this country. Besides the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes organizations, there is an organization called the Backward Classes League. As a matter of fact, you can safely say that 96 per cent of the people of India are economically very backward. Indeed, apart from a handful of men, most of the people are backward. Anyhow, we have to think more of those who are more backward because we must aim at progressively producing a measure of equality in opportunity and other things. In the modern world today, you cannot go on for long having big gaps between those who are at the top and those who are at the bottom. You cannot make all men equal, of course. But we must at least give them equality of opportunity. So, I hope that these community centres will not

merely pick out the best and most favourable spots and help them start but also try to work out the problems of the other spots which are backward economically, socially and in other respects and thus gain a wealth of experience of various types and conditions in India, so that this tremendous problem of backwardness may be tackled in the best and quickest way possible.

HOPEFUL PROSPECTS

I AM speaking to you over the radio after a long time and there are many things that I should like to talk about, for much has happened during this interval. But today I shall speak to you chiefly about our food situation. I should have preferred to do so a week or two later when, perhaps, I could have given you more facts. Our Food Minister, Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, is touring the States in order to confer with the State Ministers, to take personal stock of the situation and to decide with their co-operation what steps to take. He has not yet finished his survey of the situation and so I cannot, for the present, talk to you in detail. However, since I had fixed tonight for my broadcast, I kept to it. Even though I shall not give you much new information today, I should like to talk to you about our common problems, because it is very necessary that there should be a close understanding between the people of this great country and the Government they have elected.

For many years we have had to face tremendous difficulties in the matter of food. The last Great War, the Partition of India, overwhelming natural disasters in the shape of earthquakes, floods and drought and the growing population created a heavy deficit of food in the country. Food is after all a primary necessity and if we fail in feeding our people adequately, we can make little progress in other directions.

We had to import large quantities of foodgrains—wheat and rice and milo—at enormous expense. We have struggled against famine and scarcity in many parts of India and even in recent months we have had very difficult conditions in Rayalaseema, parts of Mysore, the Sunderbans area in Bengal, eastern Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat, Saurashtra, the Hissar District in the Punjab and Ajmer. In some parts of India it has been difficult to get even drinking water.

Some districts of Madras, such as Rayalaseema, had been particularly unfortunate. They had severe drought for four successive years. We sent our army for relief work and, from all accounts, they did a very good job of it, indeed. They demonstrated that they were just as good in serving the people in a civil capacity as in a military one. Even as we grappled with the difficult situation in Rayalaseema, bounteous rain fell from the heavens and broke a long spell. For Rayalaseema, it was literally a blessing. Let us hope it is the end of the ill-luck we have been having in the country for the last four years.

We have tried, to the best of our ability, to give relief by productive works, by deepening wells and boring new ones, by desilting tanks, by authorizing agricultural loans and remissions of land revenue and by the distribution of free food, when needed.

In spite of our manifold difficulties there seems to be a change for the better in the food situation. For the first time we have large stocks of foodgrains; prices have generally gone down, except for those of the imported grains. Our stock position is satisfactory for the present and, to that extent, is some insurance against future mishap. We started the year with a stock of 13.3 lakh tons of foodgrains. At present we hold a stock of more than 36 lakh tons, of which a little over 3.5 lakh tons is held directly by the Centre. The wheat harvest is good and our procurement this year has been better than it was last year. More foodgrains are being imported from abroad. There is plenty of wheat and milo in the country. There is not quite enough rice but we are making special efforts to get it in larger quantities.

Prices of locally produced foodgrains have gone down

but unfortunately we have had to pay heavily for imported grains and thus the pool rate of supplies to the States had to be increased. Great distress was caused when the Central subsidy on foodgrains was withdrawn, though special relief was given in regard to milo and in some other ways. The distress, however, led to a more correct appraisal of our food situation for the first time. At the beginning of the year, the States asked us to import over seven million tons of foodgrains, a quantity which, besides being quite impossible for us to import, was not available in the markets of the world. The quantity was reduced to five million tons after some argument. Later we reduced it still further to four million tons. Anyhow, now we know what exactly our needs are and since we have a large stock of our own, it is well within our competence to supply those needs. Therefore, the future is hopeful. Prices are going down and the Central Government is taking steps to reduce the pool prices of wheat and milo all over the country.

This is the background of the food situation and it seems to me satisfactory. But we have to be wary. We cannot afford to grow complacent or relax our vigilance. We have always to be prepared for every contingency whether it is due to drought or to the activities of anti-social people or to particular conditions in the world.

We have often been criticized for having a policy of controls but we are convinced that any relaxation at this stage will involve grave risks. We dare not risk another rise in prices because it will bring misfortune in its trail. Therefore, in spite of criticism, we have continued to follow a general policy of control.

We have made an exception in the case of Madras State where controls have been removed for the moment. The whole State has been divided up into six zones, five of which are more or less self-sufficient in regard to food; the sixth, comprising Malabar and the Nilgiris, has a heavy deficit. There is to be free movement within each zone but there will be certain barriers between any two zones. We shall make special arrangements to supply food to Malabar and the Nilgiris and have fair price shops in the other zones so as to check

high prices. A ration of five ounces of rice will be provided for the present holders of ration cards. There will also be a free market where foodgrains of any kind can be purchased.

Conditions were peculiarly favourable for such a step in Madras. Madras has a stock of rice which will last her for more than a year if we calculate on the basis of the present quota of rations; there is a large quantity of wheat and milo in addition. Prices in the free market are low. These being the conditions, the recent changes in Madras involved hardly any risk. We have insured ourselves against such risk as there may be by opening Government Fair Price Shops which will control prices. Our administrative machinery in Madras will be kept in readiness. Any untoward development can thus be immediately controlled. I hope and believe that the steps we have taken in Madras will prove successful and that it will not be necessary to revert to a stricter system of controls.

I shall not say much about the other States now because we are still considering their problems. It should be understood that we do not propose to abandon controls or procurement, though our manner of procurement may vary. Where conditions are favourable and risks negligible, we shall relax barriers and permit freer movement of foodgrains. We want to remove irksome restrictions as far as possible and offer an incentive to producers to grow more.

Now is the time for all of us—Central and State Governments, producers, distributors and consumers—to co-operate in solving the food problem which has been a menace to us for many years. The solution may take some time but we can go a long way towards it, if we try hard enough. It is essential to produce more and prevent hoarding. Procurement must be made easy and prices must be kept down.

There are many ways of increasing food production; more land can be brought under cultivation; more water can be supplied by irrigation or otherwise; and there can be more intensive cultivation. State Governments all over India have undertaken schemes for this purpose. Perhaps the most important of the methods of increased production is more intensive cultivation. If we increase the yield per acre even

by a little, the total increase will be considerable. Our yield at present is very poor and there is no reason why we should not increase it as other countries have done. Our farmers are hardworking but sometimes they lack good seed or good manure or something else that is necessary. The Governments will certainly help them but ultimate success can only come through self-help or, better still, through the co-operatives of farmers working together for their common good.

Over two years ago, the Government of India introduced a Crop Competition Scheme on a countrywide scale in order to increase food production. We are now having our crop competition fortnight for this half year. This competition has already yielded very fine results and prizes for the highest yield in the village or *mandal* or district or State have been awarded to several farmers. Three crops were originally selected for competition, namely, wheat, paddy and potatoes. This year gram, *jowar* and *bajra* have also been included.

We want these competitions to be held in every village under the organization of the Gram Panchayat or the Agricultural Development Committee or Co-operative Societies. The prizes for wheat go up to Rs. 500. A tractor costing Rs. 7,000 will be the all-India prize. A diesel engine will be given for the biggest yield in paddy. Those who win prizes will be awarded certificates of merit along with the title of *Krishi Pandit*.

The results obtained in these competitions so far have been remarkable. In Uttar Pradesh, the highest yield for wheat per acre has been over 59 maunds and over 726 maunds for potatoes. For paddy, the figure is over 73 maunds in West Bengal and 146 maunds in Madras.

These figures show what we can do if we make up our minds to do it. Even if these figures are exceptional, the average is bound to go up and only a ten per cent increase in our average yield will solve all our food problems.

I consider these crop competitions very important and I hope they will spread to every village in India. In Uttar Pradesh, there are 60,000 competitors this year. It is hoped that there will be over 9 lakhs of competitors for the next

competition this year. But this is not enough. We want every farmer to enlist and to take part in these competitions.

I hope what I have told you will indicate that we are turning the corner in regard to food production and that the prospects are certainly hopeful. But everything depends upon our own efforts and our will to achieve. Given that will, success is certain, even though ill fortune may sometimes attend our efforts. I hope, therefore, that you will undertake this task with earnestness, strength of will and the prayer that good fortune be yours.

Before I conclude, may I offer you my grateful thanks for the innumerable messages of greeting and goodwill that came to me on my assumption, for the second time, of the high office of Prime Minister? Vast numbers of friends and comrades, known and unknown, from all over the country sent these heartening messages and I felt infinitely grateful and very humble on receipt of this high token of your affection and goodwill. May I be worthy of it and may our beloved motherland advance and prosper by our service and our joint efforts.

V2 y⁷ M89x K4.2 31416

THE DIGNITY OF LABOUR

I AM glad to be present at this *Sannidhan*. It will be out of place to talk of revolution here. It has become almost a habit with us to repeat old grievances and narrate old tales. I do not mean that we should not persist in righting wrongs, old though they be; but we must, at the same time, be alert and keep our heads on our shoulders. This country belongs to all of us. Before we attained independence our main object was to drive the foreigners out of this land. We talked of social and economic reforms then, too, but our struggle at that time was mainly political.

After the attainment of *Swaraj*, economic and social

Translated from speech in Hindi at the inauguration of the Harijan Convention, Wardha, November 1, 1952

problems have begun to loom large before us. There may be differences of opinion about these problems but the question is how to solve them. We talk of *Gandhivad* and other *vads* or 'isms' but our chief defect is that we are more given to talking about things than to doing them. We seem to think that social and economic reforms can be achieved merely by resolutions or legislations.

You ought to give thought to your problems but I would ask you to broaden your vision and think of India, of Bharat Mata, as a whole. Who is Bharat Mata? It is you—the *janata* and the question before us is how to raise the economic standard of the nation.

Giving government jobs to a few people will not solve the problem of the crores of Indians who are unemployed. It is not possible for the Government to find employment for everybody. If unqualified people are employed, the country will suffer. Let all those who are engaged in an occupation do their job well, for production is proportionate to the work done. The prosperity of a nation depends on its capacity for production and on a rational distribution of wealth. In order to ensure the latter, we must get rid of all the present bottle-necks.

A revolution cannot increase our wealth, which really calls for hard work. After the revolution of 1917, the Russians had to work tremendously hard before they could reach their present position. They had their Five Year Plans and laboured with diligence and patience for them. The people gladly endured hardship and suffering so that the foundation of their Republic may be true and strong. The Russian Revolution took place 35 years ago and it is only now that the people are beginning to gather the fruit of their labours. For the first decade, they had to work hard and suffer even more than they did under the old regime; but they had courage and confidence. Revolution can remove an old regime but it cannot make a nation wealthy overnight. To improve their lot, the Russians toiled and sweated and have now come into their own.

From Socialist Russia to Capitalist America is a far cry. It is true that America is two and a half times as big as India

but the ratio of American production is far higher than ours. They have devised means of increasing their wealth. The average income of a working man is about a thousand rupees a month. The American people recognize the dignity of labour. Even the sons of the rich earn their living while they learn. They think it derogatory to live on the earnings of others.

We have got to change our mentality. At present we are apt to look down on manual labour and that tendency is responsible for our present plight. There are two kinds of unemployment in our country—there are people who do not find work and there are those who are not willing to work. During my recent tour of Assam I came across a young girl, who was carrying a load of fire-wood on her head. I stopped and spoke to her. I was surprised because she spoke perfect English. She had been educated in England. Her parents had lost their all in Pakistan and were reduced to penury. In spite of her background, she did not hesitate to do manual work. The most important thing is the will to work. The prosperity of a nation is judged by the number of people who are employed. Unemployment is the bane of a nation.

I shall now come to an important social problem. It cannot be gainsaid that the Harijans have been oppressed for ages. Certain cruel customs have sprung up and they cannot be eradicated merely by legislation. Even so, I am sure that the present world conditions are bound, sooner or later, to bring about a basic change in the situation. If we want to prosper as a nation, we must put a premium on efficiency and competence and, therefore, only those who are competent should be given employment in the Government. Nepotism, favouritism or reservation will lower the standard of government work. It worries me to find our standard of efficiency falling. It will be dangerous to allow this state of affairs to continue, because in the next four or five years new responsibilities will devolve on us.

It is wrong to think the government services are there to maintain the people. In advanced countries, it is no honour to be a government servant. It is only in backward countries,

where there is a great deal of unemployment, that government services are given undue importance.

The test of competency is not merely a university degree. Our greatest responsibility today is to give every child—boy or girl—equal opportunity. My heart saddens when I see our young children going about half naked, half starved. It is our duty to supply them with proper nourishment and clothing. We have a glorious past and our history goes back thousands of years; but our civilization had its evils also, the caste system not the least of them. We must draw lessons from our past and rise to new heights.

THE IMAGINATIVE APPROACH

I AM happy to be present here today not only because the subject with which you deal is important but also to pay a tribute to the work done by Indian engineers. The words 'Irrigation and Power' excite my mind and all kinds of ideas come to me—ideas of history and long perspective of human progress. I do not know what kind of history books are written for schools nowadays. The kind of history that really counts does not merely present the names of kings and big individuals but traces the progress as also the occasional set-backs of humanity. The biggest development in the history of humanity was, I suppose, the discovery of agriculture. Irrigation came later. I think it would be a fascinating study to find out how the development of irrigation has affected human progress. That would naturally mean going into the development of various techniques and devices that have affected agriculture and finally coming to the latest techniques and the latest uses of power.

There are the themes overriding the so-called national conflicts which affect the whole human race. In spite of the fact that there has been so much development in the applica-

Speech at the Silver Jubilee celebrations of the Central Board of Irrigation and Power, New Delhi, November 17, 1952

tion of science, our minds remain narrow and limited and cannot get over the narrow boundaries, not only of geography but what is much worse, of the mind. The subject of irrigation and power, as I said, excites me and is full of adventure for me. When I look at the map of India in my office—and I look at it very often—it stares me in the face. It is a huge map with marked physical features. That mighty chain of mountains in the north and north-east, called the Himalayas, is given a particular colour. I often think that not only is this great mountain chain a boundary and a frontier of India rising like a great sentinel, inspiring so much of our culture and thought through the ages but that this mighty chain is also an untapped source of vast energy. The energy flows out in great rivers, watering the plains of India, running into the sea and forming minerals and the rest of it. If only we could utilize this mighty reservoir of energy to full purpose, what could we not do with it? Since it has to do with human progress, this subject is full of adventure and excitement for me and I should like you to consider it in the same way, because you thereby give life to something that is otherwise dull and dry.

Now, as a politician and as one who meddles in many other things not directly connected with politics, I have to deal with very difficult material. You can measure with your techniques and rules the hardness or the strength of this metal or that, of stone and iron and so on but how do you measure the content of a human individual? A politician in the real sense of the word has to deal with human beings as material and not with stones and steel and iron and the like. Human material is not only a difficult material but also an exciting material because it is a live, growing, changing and dynamic thing. No two persons are alike and we have to build with that material! If you deal with stones and cement and steel and iron in a dead way without any feeling of building life or something that is akin to life, then you are second-rate men. You have not grasped the problem; you are just people sitting down at a table with pen and ink writing down figures and calculations, which may, of course, be useful, but you have lost the essence and meaning of the

work you are doing. That applies to every politician and to every profession. It applies more especially to those of us who, like me, inexorably grow in years. We grow static in mind and it is extraordinarily difficult to prevent it. One loses the resilience of mind which is a necessary concomitant of life. When that resilience goes, then a person begins to recite pet phrases and pet dogmas, whether it has to do with religion or science or any other branch of human activity. These pet phrases are characteristic of a mind that is dead and has lost the capacity for growth. I find a great deal of this narrow-mindedness. When a man says: 'We have the truth, you have not. We know this, you do not,' then I suspect him. I feel that he has lost touch with something that was growing, that he has got left behind.

The point I want you to appreciate is that even the work you do here should be infused with adventure, life and the things that come out of life. When you are building a bridge it signifies infinitely more than just a bridge. When you are working for a river valley scheme, for instance, you must also see the other vast things that flow from it besides canals and irrigation and hydro-electric works and industry and all that. There is something even more important than these, and that is, the progress of humanity in a particular direction. If your imagination is fired by an idea or a problem, then the work that you do will be vital whether you do it as a chief engineer or a small engineer, a mechanic or even as an unskilled labourer. It is sad that imagination counts for so little today and we work in grooves. I suppose, too much imagination would lead us astray and we do have to keep our feet on the ground. Nevertheless, too little of it is also a handicap. I find that one could do with a good deal more of imaginative approach here in this city of New Delhi. A man who sits cooped up in an office becomes static and a dead-weight. If I may make a personal confession, that is why I occasionally want to run away from New Delhi and rush about from place to place. I want to escape from the deadly static atmosphere of paper and files and ink in which one forgets that there are human beings in India. We consider figures but figures are no human beings; figures are only

hints or some suggestions as to what human beings are. Well, I get out and I see the faces of my people and your people and derive from them inspiration and what is much more important, something dynamic and growing. I grow with them and to some extent get in tune with them. I hope, I also affect, to some extent, the mood and tune of their minds. Whatever capacity you may work in, I am quite sure, you will deteriorate, unless you go down to the field and do the job yourself and unless you refuse to consider any job too low for you. You have to maintain a direct contact with the living thing that you are building. A bridge is a living thing if you look at it imaginatively; everything is living if only you look at it with the eye of imagination and are alive to what the thing is and what it means to humanity. It is part of human life and human progress. Engineers, therefore, are, normally speaking, fortunate, because they have to work in the field which an average person sitting in an office does not have a chance to do.

Our ideas of education which are very slowly being given effect to—I wish the pace was faster—revolve round this so-called basic education. There are many virtues in basic education; but the main thing is that you really get down to something and not just repeat things from a book. You get even the smallest child to do something. Of course, there is nothing specially Indian about it. Modern education is like that everywhere. In India, a certain trend has been given to it, notably by Mahatmaji. The idea is to get down to the job with your hands and feet and not talk about it. I am tired of people who merely talk about things. However wise you may be, you can never enter into the spirit of a thing if you only talk about it and do nothing. Even scientists have a tendency to let a wonderful experiment remain an experiment once it has been performed. The next stage somehow does not come. They may well say that the next stage is somebody else's job but I think, if the scientist had a sense of practical application, he would either try to do it himself or get somebody else to do it. This association of thought with action is, I think, of utmost importance. Thought without action is an abortion; action

without thought is folly. They must always be allied, whatever we may do. As I said before, they are normally allied in an engineer and, therefore, he perhaps keeps fresher than others do. Also, the engineer is actually building; he is not planning for others to build. There is some value in making plans, of course; it has to be done but the man who does the job in the field is actually creating something and there is nothing like creative activity for the growth of the individual and the community.

As I said, you engineers are fortunate; but you are fortunate only if you realize your good fortune and live up to it. If you also become static under the enervating atmosphere of New Delhi or wherever you live, then so much the worse for you. However high your intellectual attainments might be, you will lose the living touch and it is the living touch that counts in life, whatever you may or may not do.

I confess I was very much surprised to learn that samples of some materials had been sent for testing to distant countries. Of course, it may be that a particular object sometimes has to be sent abroad but to adopt such a procedure in the normal course seems to me an amazing confession of our weakness and inability to do anything. If you have to get things tested abroad, what are these dozens of laboratories and all these scientific and research institutes here for? I think this matter should be looked into.

If I may take this matter a little further, I am not at all enamoured and as the days go by I become more and more suspicious of the crowds of people who go out of India for so-called education. Undoubtedly, there has been some change in this state of affairs since the days when I went abroad. At that time, a great majority of Indian students used to go to the United Kingdom in the hope of adorning the profession of law subsequently. Well, some of them did; most of them did not. Now people go mostly for technical studies, and this of course is infinitely better. Such information as I have, goes to show that most Indian students in England and America do well in their work. I have nothing against that. In every matter, be it education, science, culture or anything else, I dislike nothing so much as the

narrowly nationalistic approach which makes us think that we have attained the summit of wisdom and that we need not learn anything more. That kind of attitude denotes a static condition. And anything that is static becomes stagnant and gradually leads to death. I am all for opening our minds to every kind of knowledge or information that can be obtained. I am all for free intercourse with the rest of the world; I am all for inviting people from other countries to come here to learn from us and to teach us. I want no barriers. Therefore, it is not with a view to having a barrier that I say what I am going to say.

I have explained what my basic position is. Even so, I feel surprised at this excessive enthusiasm to rush abroad to learn something. It is, indeed, amazing how many people are constantly going abroad. I am not talking, for the moment, of students. That is quite another matter. Students should certainly go but I shall qualify that by saying that they should go only if they are capable of profiting by it and that not everybody whose parents have superfluous cash need go. I am talking for the present of people other than students. During the last two or three years, there has been such an abundance of all kinds of scholarships, fellowships, this, that and the other that I have lost count of them. We became rather alarmed at the large numbers of people who went abroad. This included a very large number of officials of the Government of India and State Governments who, instead of doing their jobs, were constantly trying to learn something from abroad. This desire was no doubt laudable. We tried to make a rule so that nobody in government service could go without special reference to the Cabinet itself. The result of that rule was that half the work of the Cabinet was to consider these applications! It is amazing. The other day, I had a chart prepared to show how many officials had gone abroad in the course of one year. It astonished me to see the number which ran into many hundreds. I agree that we should aim at higher efficiency and that our officials should go and learn. What disturbs me is the scale at which this has happened because of these scholarships and fellowships and things like that. There is a

tendency to accept these scholarships too readily, because people feel that the United Nations or the FAO or some other organization is paying for them. They do not realize that payments are never made for nothing. In fact, a good part of the expense does fall on us. We also lose the services of a highly paid man for a period. What do we pay him for?

There is yet another aspect to this problem—and this applies to students as well as to others who go abroad. We do want to learn the highest technique and to make our people as efficient as anybody else in the world. But we should like them to be efficient and yet to fit into the scheme of things in India. Obviously, the highest type of efficiency is that which can utilize existing material to the best advantage. If a person has to work in India as an Indian must, then he must know how to work in India. It is no good if a man comes back from America and tells me, 'I will do this and that if you get this and that equipment from America.' When expensive machinery of all kinds which we have not got, which we cannot afford to get is not available, he bemoans his lot—'How backward we are, we cannot do this, we have not got this and we have not got that.' He becomes frustrated and the very special knowledge that he has obtained is of little use to us because his mind has somehow been adapted to a different environment. That environment may be very good but it so happens that our environment is different. The result is that we can derive no profit from the expenditure of so much time, energy and money on the education of a student or an official. You have to function in India with the material and environment of India and you have to make that go as far as possible. Certainly we shall get equipment and machinery from abroad where needed but it should only come when it is absolutely necessary. As far as possible, it should only come once and we should then produce it ourselves. There is no point in putting up magnificent structures with the aid of foreign equipment. They will be just showcases that do not fit into the general scope of the development of India.

I entirely agree with what the President said about the far greater importance of developing our smaller valley

systems. It is true that to a large extent we have to go in for enormous undertakings but our emphasis should be on developing India as a whole. We are not out to develop one little part of it more than the rest. The more we spread out the development, the better it is. Of course, everything has ultimately to be judged by the general progress, development and advancement of the human beings involved, not by a show-structure put up for others to see so that you may be able to show off your skill. I do not mean that we should not experiment or go ahead with specialized things. We must do that also, otherwise we cannot progress and our levels remain low.

There is, however, one difficulty. If you look at the political field or the economic field or any other field, you find two slightly contradictory tendencies. One is the tendency to centralize. Now, centralization is inevitable in the modern world, whether it is governmental or of any other kind. It may give you better results, it may develop better efficiency and all the rest of it, although a stage arrives in the progress of centralization when perhaps efficiency does not grow but lessens. The other tendency is, shall I say, the growth of individual, human freedom. Undoubtedly, the greater the centralization, the less the individual freedom, even though the results obtained might be better. Some people prefer the processes of decentralization because they allow the individual to grow more. On the other hand, there are certain very important things in modern life which cannot be decentralized if you want any progress at all. Well, you have got to balance all these things but the main thing is that the growth of the individual human being or group cannot be imposed. A human being grows and ought to grow like a flower or a plant. You cannot pull it out; you can water it, you can help it grow; you can give it good soil; you can put it in the fresh air or in the sun. But it has to grow itself; you cannot make it grow by force. Many of our people sometimes think that you could make something grow by some decree from above but you cannot.

I do not know if I have talked relevantly or not about irrigation and power. But being somewhat imaginatively

inclined, my mind runs off in various directions. I was talking to you about the effect the map of India with the Himalayas produced on me. I thought of the tremendous source of power, often enough running to waste and of the potential energy which is there for you to tap. I wonder if ever there will be somebody wise enough and knowledgeable enough to write the story of our rivers. What a wonderful story they would make! Let us take the story of the Ganga. It will be the story of India and more especially of North India. It will be far more important, far more living and real than all the trumpery history books that you have. It will be the story of the growth of Indian culture and civilization; it will be the story of the great cities on the Ganga; it will be the story of the Gangetic valley and the water of the Ganga helping irrigation and so on; it will be the story of the rise and fall of empires; it will be the story of the development of human life, of people, Aryans as well as other races, coming down from the north-western frontier to the broad plains of India right up to the Ganga. It will be a magnificent story if it could be written properly. Of course, it is not the engineer's job to write it but I want the engineer who works on these rivers to have an imaginative approach to his work. Then the water he deals with will become alive. Even the stones will tell a story. I should like, not only the big engineer or the middling engineer but also the small engineer to think in this way and to convey something of this exciting approach to the worker in the field. Make him realize that he is also working with live material, even though it might be stone or steel and that it will give birth to further life. Let him be a partner in this adventure that you are starting. If you approach your problems in this spirit, the results will ultimately be far speedier and other results will also follow. In the process, the worker and the engineer will also progress and advance and become better men and women.

NO CHANGE IN FOOD POLICY

I HAVE hesitated to intervene in this debate because I wanted hon. Members to have as much time as possible to discuss this most important matter. Later, my colleague, the Food Minister, will reply to this debate fully. My colleague, the Finance Minister, gave a very lucid analysis of the situation yesterday and made clear the basic policy not only of the Government but also on behalf of the Planning Commission—not that the two are separate or in opposition—and he spoke with authority since he has a great deal to do with the burdens of both. Yet I want to say a few words, because recently there has been some confusion in the public mind and many things have been said which appear to me to have no justification whatever. Newspapers have splashed big headlines, leading the public to imagine things that did not exist. I wish to clear the confusion as far as possible.

The hon. Member who asked me earlier in this session whether there would be a debate on food policy was probably under the impression that some big changes were under consideration. As a matter of fact, a change in policy was neither intended nor suggested. Certain minor changes are certainly contemplated; but they have nothing to do with the basic policy that the Government has attempted to follow and intends to pursue in future.

I am sure the House will realize that during the last few years the Food Ministry has had to face very difficult problems. The Government and the Cabinet have, of course, shared to some extent in carrying the burdens of the Food Ministry but the person who was ultimately responsible was the Food Minister in office. I am not denying that we have made mistakes but we have also endeavoured to profit by them. It must be conceded that the food situation in the country, which was difficult for a long time, has now considerably eased. Although other factors have contributed to the improvement, I think we are justified in saying that the present favourable situation is, to some extent, the result of

Government policy also. In this connection I should like to pay tribute to my colleague, the Food Minister, who has approached the very difficult and complicated subject of food with an energy and an awareness which, I think, have produced certain positive results all over the country.

The House has already had a fair dose of figures and details, so I shall not go into them. But it is essential that we do not miss the wood for the trees. In a debate of this kind, it is natural that hon. Members should be more concerned with the situation in their particular State or area: and it is right that they should do so. Nevertheless, the most important thing is that we keep in view India and her food problem as a whole and remember our basic policy.

It is open to the House to discuss our basic policy but in so far as the Government is concerned, there has been no occasion to effect any change in it. And as far as we can see, no such occasion is likely to arise. I can only add that our basic approach will remain unchanged, even though the food position is much brighter.

The Finance Minister pointed out the close relationship between the food question and planning. I put it in a more homely way when I said that planning was a kind of house-keeping for the nation. The fact that we are now better off in many respects does not mean that we should leave the nation's house-keeping to random forces. What we should do is to modify and improve our methods of house-keeping if we find that they are inadequate. But in regard to the supply of food and other necessities of life, it is not enough merely to see that there is fair distribution or that people do not prosper at the cost of others. If we do this and no more, our economy will remain static. We must also see that we get the best out of our development and planning programmes. For instance, if there is a surplus of food in the country, we would naturally like the nation to be fed more adequately; but we must also think beyond the immediate wants of the present and utilize our resources with foresight. There is, for instance, a pressing need for development in the country and we should really be thinking in terms of eventually exporting some of our surplus food so that we can

increase our capacity for importing essential goods like heavy machinery. Perhaps, the House remembers that, about twenty years ago, a phrase became rather notorious in Germany: guns *versus* butter. In those days, Nazi Germany preferred guns to butter; her people gladly went without butter so that they could export it and get guns for the money thus earned. Of course, we are not interested in guns in the same way; nor are we going to give up butter for guns. We might, however, have to give up butter for something more useful to us in our economic development. Even though we possess all the necessities of life, we must learn to tighten our belts in order to get the things we do not immediately want but which are vital for future growth. I do not suggest that we should do without adequate and healthy food but I see no reason why we should put up with circumstances which allow the wastage of food. It is difficult enough—at least for some of us—to plan our own house-keeping. To take charge of house-keeping for the entire nation is, therefore, a very intricate and difficult matter, indeed. The basic issue before the House is whether we can entrust this vital and important matter to free enterprise and an absolutely free market.

Today, the conception of free enterprise and an absolutely free market is out of date, because an economy based on them soon becomes unmanageable. In a country like India, where resources are limited and have to be stretched to capacity, we cannot let free enterprise and an absolutely free market dominate the scene. That does not mean that we should wipe out the free market completely but we have necessarily to control the basic economy of the country at strategic levels. That especially applies to food. The nature of government control should depend on the existing circumstances. We can easily discuss this as it concerns factual data. I should like to give the House a parallel from the army. The function of an army is to control a particular area or State. He would, indeed, be a foolish general who would spread his army in every village of the area and try to control every independent individual. The situation could be controlled more effectively if he were to concentrate

only at strategic points. This applies to our policy of food distribution also. We cannot allow powerful forces to upset the basis on which we plan to act. It remains to be considered, however, what the strategic points in regard to food distribution are. Also, we must not formulate our policy on the presumption that nothing untoward will happen and that there will always be a good harvest. Take Pakistan, for instance. Pakistan flourished like the green bay-tree in regard to food for three years or more. Then prices shot up because of the Korean war. Pakistan made a lot of money and very unfavourable comparisons were made between India and Pakistan in respect of the food situation. It is not for me to criticize the policy of the Pakistan Government. I do not know the details but it is obvious that a single bad harvest has thrown the administration completely out of gear. They have had a bad time in regard to food. Here is a country with a considerable surplus of food suddenly faced with a heavy deficit and forced to have recourse to importing food from the far corners of the earth! Therefore, we cannot afford to base our policy merely on hopes. Let us realize that.

The other question to be considered is the application of strategic controls or the periodical relaxation of non-strategic controls. Although this is a detail, it has an important bearing on the actual working out of an effective policy of food distribution. It does not necessarily follow that a single policy will answer the needs of the whole country. Conditions vary in different States and one has to adapt oneself to them, although the basic approach must remain uniform. Its implementation will necessarily depend on internal factors peculiar to the State in question. When one of these factors happens to be food, it has to be considered very carefully indeed. I heard the other day that one of our State Governments was taking action against a large number—I think it was 15,000—of young boys for a petty offence like carrying a handful of rice or wheat from here to there. When a State is constrained to spend all its administrative energy on catching little boys, there is something wrong in its method of approach. There is nothing wrong with control; but there

is something wrong with wasting energy on trivial offences while the major offenders get away. It is far better to impose some kind of regulation which, if I may repeat, gives the State Governments more control over the strategic points than to catch hold of boys and girls for technical breaches.

There is a tendency in each State to consider itself as something different from the rest. But the poor people living on the borders of the States probably have no such distinctive feeling. They may have their relatives on one side and the nearest market on the other side of the border. It would, therefore, be natural for them to want to cross over. So, the less we upset the normal functions on the border, the better it will be. We would avoid harassing situations which do not in any way help our basic economy and are only a needless burden.

It must be made perfectly clear that, at the present moment, our concern is not with rice and wheat. We are dealing specifically with millets which constitute a considerable portion—about 40 per cent or so—of our food consumption. Millets are normally produced for local consumption and have, therefore, not been distributed on as large a scale as rice and wheat have been. For this reason, the distribution of millets, in spite of the fact that they constitute 40 per cent of our food consumption—I speak subject to correction—has not aggravated the food problem as much as wheat and rice have done. All I am saying is that every step we take should be considered from the point of view of its effect on the general situation and in particular on the rice and wheat situation. So far, the millet situation has not affected our policy very much but if we go a step further and if, as is proposed, we maintain State barriers for millets, leaving only internal freedom of movement, we shall be maintaining a good deal of control. The proposed step, therefore, appears to be a fairly safe one from the point of view of our larger policy. At the same time, it eliminates a great deal of petty troubles and harassments. It gives us a chance to see how things develop; if they do not develop satisfactorily, it is always open to us to revoke this step and try something else. I suggest to the House that this is the

proper approach. I believe that an amendment has been made to the effect that the Government should not only accept and approve of the general policy of control but also be agreeable to any advantageous adjustments or modifications that are in keeping with its basic policy. The amendment runs thus:

“and having considered the same, this House approves of the policy of Government regarding general control of foodgrains and welcomes the desire of Government to adjust the same to suit local or temporary conditions without prejudice to the basic objectives.”

I think that amendment represents correctly the position of the Government. I should like the House to realize that the basic fact of our food policy is the control of foodgrains. This is essential, because we must grow more in our country and distribute it equitably, if we are to work for a steady and rapid decline in the import of foodstuffs. At the same time, we must recognize that ours is not merely a doctrinaire approach—which has no relation to changing facts and changing situations—or one that merely harasses people without producing any results.

We just cannot function if we concentrate only on 10 or 15 per cent of our people and forget the others. Among the others, there are a large number of people who are food producers. The difficulty arises in the case of those who are neither food producers nor city dwellers nor dwellers of rationed areas. Any policy that we frame must keep in view the necessity of keeping the prices down for these people.

Yesterday, Dr Lanka Sundaram reminded me of the repeated statements I made three years ago to the effect that we would put an end to all food imports by March or April 1952. I forget when exactly I made that statement but I did so in all sincerity and with every intention of trying my best. I regret, however, that my words have been falsified and I feel thoroughly ashamed that what was almost a pledge to the country has been broken. Therefore, I am very much averse to making any definite statement or pledge now. But I do not see why I should not say that we intend making every effort to reduce food imports and, if possible, put an

end to them within the period of the Plan, unless grave emergencies occur. This is our proposition and the statistics, as they appear now, give us some hope that it is a feasible one.

ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

I HAVE A FEELING that another stage in our journey has been reached and a duty done—well done, if I may say so. At the same time, I feel even more strongly that a still more difficult duty is ahead of us. Another journey has immediately to be undertaken in which there are no resting places.

As far as the present Plan is concerned, it may be said to have had its beginning long before the Planning Commission came into existence. Much thought and many discussions had been devoted to the question of planning in India before the Planning Commission was actually created. I suppose I can speak about the Planning Commission without being unduly modest, because my connection with it has been intimate. Nevertheless, the burden of work fell lightly upon me. Others carried the burden and if I praise the work of the Commission, I do not praise myself. As I said, I can speak a little more freely about it than if I had been one of the recipients of my own praise.

The Planning Commission has worked very hard, very conscientiously, very earnestly and with a true crusading spirit in preparing this Plan.

I should like, therefore, to pay tributes to them—and it is not empty tribute paid blindly but tribute paid with due knowledge of what they have done. And that, if I may say so, need not necessarily mean that we agree or disagree with any particular chapter or particular part of the Report. The work of the Commission is, in a sense, the first of its kind—certainly the first of its kind in India. I think we might justifiably add that, in its particular context, it is the first

thing of its kind anywhere. (Planning became well known when the first Five Year Plan of the Soviet Union came into the field twenty years ago and has been something rather fashionable and much talked about ever since.)

It is easy to talk about planning in limited spheres of activity. Naturally, planning for a whole nation involves infinitely greater effort than planning in bits. Planning, in the larger sense, is thus an integrated way of looking at a nation's manifold activities. (I do not mean to go in for comparisons but the old Soviet approach to planning was different from ours, both from the point of view of objectives and that of the methods adopted, though the difference between the two countries was greater in the latter case. In view of the fact that we function under a democratic set-up, which we have deliberately adopted and enshrined in our Constitution and in this Parliament, any planning that we do must naturally be within that set-up. The Planning Commission does not have the right to draw up a programme that has no relation to our Constitution or to the set-up under which we work.)

Now, that puts certain self-imposed limitations on a plan but I would like to say that those limitations are not final. I do not think it would be right to say that democratic functioning necessarily means limitations. It may make the way a little more difficult; the procedure adopted may have to be a little more complicated. But it should be possible for a democratic set-up, if it is properly worked, to make provision for everything we want done. I suppose that is the only real justification for a democratic set-up—apart from other justifications. In a democracy, things are built on a firm foundation—even though it may take a longer time—and built with due consideration for the individual. However, that is not a point I wish to labour. (What I want to say is that since we have accepted a democratic set-up and the way in which our Parliament functions, we must consider this Plan on a similar basis. We have framed a Constitution and we should abide by that Constitution. Nevertheless, let it not be said that every part, every chapter and every word of that Constitution is so sacrosanct that it cannot be

changed even if the needs of the country or the nation so demand. If it is thought that some part of the Constitution comes in the way of the nation's progress, it can undoubtedly be changed—not lightly but after full deliberation. But, generally speaking, we have to plan in accordance with that Constitution.

Now, this Plan or rather its parent, the Draft Outline, was placed before the country and before this Parliament, a little over a year ago. At the time, it received general approval from Parliament and has, since then, been the subject of both approval and criticism and, in some parts of the country, of condemnation. Anyhow, the reaction to the Plan all over the country has been generally favourable. The Planning Commission has had the benefit of the criticism that was placed before them and, I must say, has profited even by the condemnation of certain parts of the Plan. I doubt if any other plan has ever been worked out in such close collaboration with various organizations, parties, States, opinions and viewpoints, in fact, with all the elements that go to make up a nation's life. In that sense, therefore, it might be said to be the result of a whole nation's efforts and not only the production of five or six people in the Planning Commission. It represents much more than just the opinions of the members of the Planning Commission. They had to deal with a very difficult problem. Of course, the country is big but, apart from its size, they had to deal with a complicated federal structure and with an economy which in many ways is very backward. They had to suffer the consequences of past acts committed by us and by others. They had to handle a kind of social consciousness which, though very desirable, is, nevertheless, new to the country. They had to keep in view the great ambition to progress rapidly, which we all share and, at the same time, to work with very limited resources to further that great ambition. They had and have to deal with a stormy period of history, a period of trial and crisis and change and to work with a sense of disaster round the corner. In India, often enough, we have to deal with a way of thinking which follows old ruts, sometimes with superstitions and with outlooks that

stand in the way of progress. We have even had to deal with the reformer of yesterday who is, if I may say so with all respect, a conservative today and with the revolutionary of yesterday, who forgets that today is different from yesterday. So, the Planning Commission had to deal with a situation that was live and dynamic and for which no religious, economic or other dogma was adequate.

We are dealing with India and not any other country. We should not try to reproduce conditions which obtain elsewhere. Of course, there are certain principles, certain ideals and objectives which hold not only for various countries but for various ages, too; they do not change. India herself has represented various principles of that type and I hope she will hold to them. At the same time, I earnestly hope and believe that she will give up the large number of superstitions and evil ways of old which have impeded her growth and which are even today used to divert people from a consideration of the essential things. Our plan for future progress must cope with the amalgam and variety we have in India. When I see these two heavy volumes of the Report of the Planning Commission, my mind conjures up the vision of something vast—the mighty theme of a nation building and re-making itself. We are, all of us, working together to make a new India—not abstractly for a nation but for the 360 million people who are wanting to progress as individuals and as groups.

In fact, we are trying to catch up, as far as we can, with the Industrial Revolution that occurred long ago in Western countries and brought about great changes in the course of a century or more. That Revolution ultimately branched off in two directions which are, at present, represented by the high degree of technological development in the United States of America on the one hand and by the Soviet Union on the other. These two types of development, even though they might be in conflict, are branches of the same tree. The Industrial Revolution has a long history from which we can learn many lessons. We are apt to think in terms of European history when we consider India. I do not understand why

we should repeat the errors of the past. We must make an effort to learn from the past.

It is obvious that India must be industrialized as rapidly as possible. And industrialization includes, of course, all kinds of industry—major, middling, small, village and cottage. However rapid our industrialization may be, it cannot possibly absorb more than a small part of the population of this country in the next ten, twenty or even thirty years. Hundreds of millions will remain who have to be employed chiefly in agriculture. These people must, in addition, be given employment in smaller industries like cottage industries and so on. Hence, the importance of village and cottage industries. I think the argument one often hears about big industry *versus* cottage and village industry is misconceived. I have no doubt that we cannot raise the people's level of existence without the development of major industries in this country; in fact, I will go further and say that we cannot even remain a free country without them. Certain things, like adequate defence, are essential to freedom and these cannot be had unless we develop industry in a major way. But we must always remember that the development of heavy industry does not by itself solve the problem of the millions in this country. We have to develop the village and cottage industry in a big way, at the same time making sure that in trying to develop industry, big and small, we do not forget the human factor. We are not merely out to get more money and more production. We ultimately want better human beings. We want our people to have greater opportunities, not only from an economic or material point of view but at other levels also. We have seen in other countries that economic growth by itself does not necessarily mean human growth or even national growth. We have to keep this in mind and also remember that the growth of a nation has little to do with the shouting to be heard in the market places and the stock exchanges of the country. So, an integrated plan for the economic growth of the country, for the growth of the individual, for greater opportunities for every individual and for the greater freedom of the country has to be drawn up and drawn up within the framework

of political democracy. Political democracy will only justify itself if it ultimately succeeds in producing these results. If it does not, it will have to yield to some other kind of economic or social structure which we may or may not like. Ultimately, it is the results that decide the structure a country will adopt. When we talk of political democracy, we must remember that it no longer has the particular significance it had in the 19th century, for instance. If it is to have any meaning, political democracy must gradually or, if you like, rapidly lead to economic democracy. If there is economic inequality in the country, all the political democracy and all the adult suffrage in the world cannot bring about real democracy. Therefore, your objective must be to put an end to all differences between class and class, to bring about more equality and a more unitary society—in other words, to strive for economic democracy. We have to think in terms of ultimately developing into a classless society. That may still be a far-off ideal; I do not know. But we must, nevertheless, keep it in view.

We, in this country, must not think of approaching our objectives through conflict and force. We have achieved many things by peaceful means and there is no reason why we should suddenly abandon that method and take to violence. There is a very special reason why we should not do so. I am quite convinced that, if we try to attain our ideals and objectives, however high they may be, by violent methods we shall delay matters greatly and help the growth of the very evils we are fighting. India is not only a big country but a country with a good deal of variety; and if anyone takes to the sword, he will inevitably be faced with the sword of someone else. This clash between swords will degenerate into fruitless violence and, in the process, the limited energies of the nation will be dissipated or, at any rate, greatly undermined.

Now, the method of peaceful progress is ultimately the method of democratic progress. Keeping in mind the ultimate aim of democratic thought, it is not enough that we should simply give our votes and leave everything else to look after itself. The ultimate aim is economic democracy. The ultimate

aim is to put an end to the differences between the rich and the poor, between the people who have opportunities and those who have very few or none. Every obstacle in the way of that aim must be removed, whether it is in a friendly and co-operative way or by State pressure or by law. Nothing should be allowed to come between you and the achievement of that social objective.

A plan of this type does not merely mean establishing a number of factories or increasing production in some instances. That, of course, is necessary but something with a deeper significance, something that aims at the gradual development of a particular structure of society has to be achieved. Of course, you and I cannot lay down what the next generation must do; nor can we predict what the next generation will be like. In these days of rapid technological advance, no man knows what the world will be like in the future. Because India is technologically backward, we sometimes discuss our big problems in a rather static way, forgetting that the very ground under our feet is always changing and may be slipping away. Unless we change with it, we may stumble or be left behind. The fact that technological advance has moved at an enormous pace since the Industrial Revolution is well known; even so, we are not emotionally aware of what is happening from day to day. It may well be that, in the course of the next ten or twenty years, this technological advance might change the whole aspect of the world and that will naturally have a tremendous effect on the life of human beings. It will affect their thinking, their economic structure, their social structure and ultimately their political structure also. Anything may happen. We cannot bind the future. We can only deal with facts as they are.

I mention these broad factors, because I feel that our minds must have that dynamic quality, that quality of vision, that revolutionary quality which even our experts lack, not to speak of the average layman. For instance, our economists and our planners have become very static in their approach. We talk of revolutions, believing all the time that a revolution is merely a process in which you can break one

another's heads. That is not a revolution. Good or bad, a revolution is something that fundamentally changes the political and economic structure of the existing society. It is with this kind of background that we must consider this first attempt of ours at planning.

Naturally, the Plan is not perfect. It is easy to pick holes in it. It is also easy to demonstrate how it is wrong here or inadequate elsewhere or to show that much more could have been done or said. But perfection is a big word and we do not presume to claim it. I have no doubt that the Planning Commission would like to profit by what has been said about the Plan. But I ask you to look at it in a wider context than one of mere criticism. This is the first attempt in India to integrate the agricultural, industrial, social, economic and other aspects of the country into a single framework of thinking. It is a very important step and even if the thinking is partly faulty it does not detract from the magnitude of what has been attempted and accomplished. It has made the whole country planning-conscious. It has made people think of this country as a whole. I think it is most essential that India, which is united politically and in many other ways, should, to the same extent, be united mentally and emotionally also. We often go off at a tangent on grounds of provincialism, communalism, religion or caste. We have no emotional awareness of the unity of the country. Planning will help us in having an emotional awareness of our problems as a whole. It will help us to see the isolated problems in villages or districts or even provinces in their larger context. Therefore, the mere act of planning, the mere act of having approached the question of progress in this way and of producing a report of this type is something on which we might, I think, congratulate ourselves.

When we talked about planning two or three years ago, powerful voices were raised against it. For some people, planning simply amounted to helping industry by tariffs or money or other means and then giving it a completely free hand. It is the essence of planning to have a broad idea of the kind of control that should be exercised over the economy of the country. This Plan deals with both the public sector

and the private sector. The House must remember—in fact, everybody should remember—that the private sector is also going to be a controlled sector. Of course, it will not be controlled to the same extent as the public sector; but it will, nevertheless, be increasingly controlled as time goes on. The control over the private sector will relate not only to its dividends and profits but will extend to all the strategic points in the economy of the country. This Report—rightly I think—is cautious about many matters. If you read it carefully, you will find that it has stated what can be done and what should be done. It has left the door open. Banking and insurance, for instance, are highly important in the economy of a country. Speaking from a strategic point of view, it is essential that they should be controlled in any economy. The Report does not deal with how this should be done, because the Planning Commission did not think it was justified in laying down directions about details. In the earlier chapters of this Report, however, the Planning Commission has pointed out the importance of banking and insurance and urged that steps be taken to control them so that they may be brought within the purview and sphere of a controlled economy.

The method of working out a plan is ultimately the method of trial and error. The best of us can see only dimly into the future, if at all. We have to utilize our past experience. What makes the Plan complicated is that we have to deal not with measurable things like steel and cement but with 360 million human beings, each of whom is different from the other. All the statisticians and economists in the world cannot say what a multitude of individuals will or will not feel or do. The method of trial and error is the only one open to us. I have no doubt that when the time comes for a second Five Year Plan, we shall be in a far better position and on firmer ground, because we will have gone through the process of thinking and planning and benefited from its consequences. Our experience of trying to build according to this Plan will, in the future, stand us in good stead. The Second Plan, therefore, will be much more effective and far-reaching, because it will be based on actual

knowledge and experience derived, not from theory, but from practice.

Although we still call this a Five Year Plan, two years of it are already over. Now, it is really a plan for the next three years or so. We started on the Plan with certain limitations, because we had to accept the existing conditions. We could not start from scratch. Our resources were already tied up in things that had been started earlier. Therefore, we had to utilize the balance of the resources as best as we could.

The Five Year Plan will, therefore, be over in another three years. We must remember that this Plan is, if I may say so, essentially a preparatory venture for greater and more rapid progress in future. As I said, the Second Five Year Plan, if we build our foundations well, will proceed at a much faster rate of progress than is indicated in the present one.

There is much talk of industrialization. In the initial chapters of the Plan, certain figures pertaining to the amounts allotted to industry, agriculture, social service, transport, etc., are given. In this respect, industry does not seem to occupy as important a place as agriculture. If I remember correctly, a very large sum is to be spent on irrigation. We certainly attach importance to industry; but in the present context we attach far greater importance to agriculture and food and matters pertaining to agriculture. If our agricultural foundation is not strong then the industry we seek to build will not have a strong basis either. Apart from that, the situation in the country today is such that, if our food front cracks up, everything else will crack up, too. Therefore, we dare not weaken our food front. If our agriculture becomes strongly entrenched, as we hope it will, then it will be relatively easy for us to progress more rapidly on the industrial front, whereas if we concentrate only on industrial development and leave agriculture in a weak condition we shall ultimately be weakening industry. That is why primary attention has been given to agriculture and food and that I think, is essential in a country like India at the present moment.

However, certain basic and key industries have been given due consideration. The essential basis for the development of industry is power—electric power. The progress made by a country can be judged by the electric power it has. That is a good test for development in any country. Provision has been made for electric power in the various hydro-electric and multipurpose schemes in the Plan.

I do not propose to cover these two big volumes in my preliminary remarks. I have no doubt that hon. Members mean to study them with great care and make their suggestions in the course of the debate. I would like to suggest, if I may, that the first four chapters—and a few others—in which the general approach, the principles and the objectives, which govern the Plan as well as the structure of the Plan are laid down, deserve more attention than the others and may profitably be studied with special care. The rest, though important, is the working out of details and no Parliament can sit down to work out details or priorities. A Parliament can only lay down the objectives and the general structure that has to be followed.

I submit, Sir, that we should bear these general principles and objectives in mind, while we determine the methods. If I may say so, we have already determined the methods and are working according to them. Even so, I wish to make our conception of democracy perfectly clear. It is not limited to political democracy. We do not think that democracy, as is sometimes believed in other countries, means the economic doctrine of *laissez-faire*. That doctrine, although some people still talk of it, is almost as dead as the century which produced it—dead even in the countries where people talk about it most. It is totally unsuited to conditions in the world today. In any event, so far as we in India are concerned, we reject it completely. We are not going to have anything to do with it. That, however, does not mean that the State will take charge of everything.

This Plan will account for two thousand odd crores of rupees—about several hundred crores above the amount provided for by the Draft Plan. There is a big gap between the estimate of our resources and the Rs. 2,000 crores. We

hope to be able to expand our resources. We may receive help from other countries. We have already done so to some extent. Some hon. Members have occasionally expressed their fear that this help from outside may impose restrictions on our freedom. It is perfectly true that such dependence involves a certain risk. If we depend on others to supply us with weapons of war for our Army or to see to our economic advancement, we shall be weakening our position. I would rather that our advance was slower than that we became dependent on the aid of other countries.

Provided we are strong enough ourselves, I really do not see why we should be afraid of accepting the kind of aid that helps us to progress more rapidly. With that aid we could do many things which we would have to postpone otherwise. Foreign aid involves a slight risk, not so much of being tied down as of compromising in a moral sense. There is no reason, however, why we should be afraid of accepting aid, if it does not influence our policy or our activities in any way.

Sir, it is late now and the subject is a comprehensive one. I intended my remarks to be a mere preamble to your consideration of this voluminous report. I have no doubt that in the course of this debate many points will be raised which will need to be dealt with by other Members, my colleagues and myself.

I would like to impart to the House something of what I feel on this occasion. The re-making of our country is a great theme and we are engaged in a tremendous task which requires not only all our united effort but united effort with enthusiasm and the crusading spirit. If the House accepts this Report in the proper spirit, I have no doubt that the Plan, from being something on paper, will become a living thing for the country. If you go to your respective constituencies with this message from this House and this Parliament, it may well be possible that we shall far exceed the expectations of the Planning Commission.

LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS

WITHIN A FEW HOURS, this year will come to an end and we shall all step into the New Year. I should like to wish all of you, who listen to me tonight, as well as others, happiness for the New Year and the will to work and build up our country. Happiness and work are really wedded together, for there can be no true happiness without the feeling that one is doing something worth while. What can be more worth while for any of us than to participate in the building up anew of this ancient and ever young country?

Three days ago, I was in Travancore-Cochin, the southern-most State of India, amidst some of the loveliest sceneries in the country. In this State live a gifted people with higher educational standards than there are anywhere else in the country. It is a progressive State and I was happy to perform two important functions there: the first marked the construction of a new railway link joining the north and the south of the State and the other was the inauguration of a factory for processing monazite. I spent two unusual days in seclusion in a game sanctuary where wild animals live protected from civilized man.

From that southern tip of India, I pictured this great country spread out before me right up to the Himalayas in the north and thought of her long and chequered story. Ours is a wonderful inheritance but how shall we keep it? How shall we serve the country which has given us so much and make her great and strong?

When we look at the world around us, there is much to give us hope but there is also a great deal to fill us with dismay, for there is fear and hatred and violence and the talk of war, just when it would seem that the prize that the world has so long sought was almost within its grasp. We look at our own country and find both good and ill, powerful forces at work to build her and also forces which would disrupt and disintegrate her. We cannot do much to affect the destiny of this world as a whole but surely we can make a brave attempt to mould the destiny of our 360 million people.

What then are we to do? What shall we aim at and what road shall we travel by? It is of the foremost importance that we should not lose ourselves in the passion and prejudice of the moment. If we are to aim high, we should adhere to the high principles which have always formed the background of Indian thought from the days of the Buddha to our own day when Gandhiji showed us the path to right action. Greatness comes from vision, the tolerance of the spirit, compassion and an even temper which is not ruffled by ill fortune or good fortune. It is not through hatred and violence or internal discord that we make real progress. As in the world today, so also in our own country, the philosophy of force can no longer pay and our progress must be based on peaceful co-operation and tolerance of each other.

In India, the first essential is the maintenance of the unity of the country, not merely a political unity but a unity of the mind and the heart, which precludes the narrow urges that make for disunity and which breaks down the barriers raised in the name of religion or those between State and State or, for that matter, any other barrier. Our economy and social structure have outlived their day and it has become a matter of urgent necessity for us to refashion them so that they may promote the happiness of all our people in things material and spiritual. We have to aim deliberately at a social philosophy which seeks a fundamental transformation of this structure, at a society which is not dominated by the urge for private profit and by individual greed and in which there is fair distribution of political and economic power. We must aim at a classless society, based on co-operative effort, with opportunities for all. To realize this we have to pursue peaceful methods in a democratic way.

We live in an age of science. We hear and read of revolutions but the greatest revolutionary force in the past 150 years has been science, which has transformed human life and has changed political, social and economic organizations. This process of change goes on at an ever-increasing pace and we have to understand it and adapt ourselves to it.

I want to tell you about the Five Year Plan which the Planning Commission has produced after two and a half

years of labour. Parliament has put its seal on it and now the time has come to implement it with all our strength. The Plan endeavours to embody the social philosophy to which I have referred. Democratic planning means the utilization of all our available resources and, in particular, the maximum quantity of labour willingly given and rightly directed so as to promote the good of the community and the individual.

I cannot tell you much about this Plan in a few minutes and I should like you to study it or at least the summaries of it because it affects each one of you; and in a democratic society everyone should understand and help in fulfilling its tasks. The Plan, of course, embraces the entire country but it also deals separately with each part of it—the States as well as the smaller local areas. It also offers opportunities for voluntary organizations and workers to fulfil a vital and increasing role in national development. It has a public sector and a private sector, though the latter has necessarily to accept a measure of control, so that the objectives of the Plan may be secured. It endeavours to integrate various activities—agriculture, industry and social services. Agriculture is bound to continue to be our principal activity. The greatest stress is laid upon it, because it is only on the basis of agricultural prosperity that we can make industrial progress. But agriculture has to be fitted into the larger economy of the nation. The growth of industry, big and small, is essential for any modern nation. Indeed, without industrial development, there cannot be any higher standard of living for our people or even enough strength in the nation for it to preserve its freedom.

A proper land policy is essential for the progress of agriculture. We have gone some way towards achieving this by putting an end to the *zamindari* and *jagirdari* systems in many States. We must complete this task, eliminate all intermediaries and fix a limit for the size of holdings. We hope that the next step will be co-operative farming which will take advantage of the latest agricultural techniques. Greater production is essential, both in agriculture and industry, if we are to fight poverty and raise standards, as we must.

We are a peaceful nation and our general policy as well as

our economy is going to be based on the methods of peace and the avoidance of exploitation. We want to develop, therefore, a balanced economy and, as far as possible, promote self-sufficiency. We want to work more particularly for the expansion of the home market so that standards may go up. In the development of self-sufficiency and the provision of work and employment, village and cottage industries are of paramount importance.

I shall mention a few of the targets we have laid down. The first one is that of food. We must become self-sufficient in food and not be dependent on other countries for our most essential requirements. The Plan will raise food production by nearly eight million tons. It is intended to provide irrigation through new major works to more than eight million acres of land and through minor works to eleven million acres. Further, it is proposed to reclaim and develop more than seven million acres of land. You know about the great river valley schemes which, besides irrigation, will supply over a million kilowatts of power to industry. Power is the foundation of all developments today. We have attached great importance to minor works of irrigation as they yield quicker and more widespread results.

Cotton production will be raised by over 12 lakh bales and jute by 20 lakh bales. It is proposed to increase the production of hand-loom cotton textiles from 800 to 1,700 million yards. In steel and cement, there will be substantial increases in production. At Sindri, we have already a large fertilizer factory and a locomotive workshop at Chittaranjan. We are setting up a new steel plant, a machine tool factory and a plant for the manufacture of heavy electrical equipment. Air transport is being nationalized and a modern ship-building industry developed.

You know about the many community centres that have been started all over the country. We attach great importance to these, for they attempt to train our men and women in rural areas in co-operative effort for the good of the community. Here, even more than elsewhere, there is room for voluntary effort.

Our ideals are high and our objectives great. Compared

with them, the Five Year Plan appears to be a modest beginning. But let us remember that this is the first great effort of its kind and that it is based on the realities of today and not on our wishes. It must, therefore, be related to our present resources or else it will remain unreal. It is designed to be the foundation of a bigger and better plan of progress in the future. Let us lay the foundations well and the rest will inevitably follow. The Plan is not based on any dogmatic or doctrinaire approach to our problems; nor is it rigid.

There is scope for advance and variation in it where necessary. As we learn from experience, we shall improve it. It is a dynamic plan for a dynamic nation determined to go ahead and stand on its feet and to bring about a new social order free from exploitation, poverty, unemployment and injustice. It is a step towards the establishment of a society which gives security to the individual and offers employment and encouragement to creative activity and adventure. If we accept it in the proper spirit and act upon it, the Plan will prove a great liberating force for the energies of the nation.

The Plan is a big one embracing innumerable activities in the country. But far bigger is the vision which draws us forward, a vision inspired by courage and hope and reasoned optimism. Let us have faith in our country and ourselves. Above all, the Plan is a programme of work. Let us work, therefore, and give up for a while empty destructive criticism. Let us all become partners in this great enterprise of building a new India.

THE NEW ROLE OF KHADI

I HAVE the greatest pleasure in inaugurating the first meeting of the newly constituted Khadi and Village Industries Board. I believe that the development of khadi and village

industries in India is of paramount importance, not only to the unemployment problem in the country but to the advancement of the nation as a whole.

However much we might develop our big industries, there is still considerable scope for the expansion of village industries in a country like India. The question is one of co-ordinating the small industries in the over-all economy of the country. We are all anxious to develop khadi and other small industries, not for the sake of a 'show' or for any exhibitionist reasons but because we want to achieve concrete results. No modern nation, however, can retain its freedom without the help of large-scale industries which should be State-owned and State-controlled.

We sincerely believe that small industries can help considerably in the economic advancement of the nation. As you know, unemployment presents our most difficult problem today and the development of village industries could certainly play a prominent role in solving it. Indeed, the Welfare State has no meaning unless every individual is employed and takes part in nation-building activities. I do not think there will be any conflict between big industry and village industry, provided there is proper co-operation.

I have heard complaints that the Government has not given adequate help to the khadi and village industries. If these industries depend for their development and existence solely on Government help and have no inherent strength or vitality of their own, they cannot survive for long. It is for the workers employed in the khadi and village industries to think seriously about this problem and its psychological aspect.

Gandhiji laid particular emphasis on the charkha, khadi and village industries. He made the charkha an economic and revolutionary symbol for the people. There was a time in the days of our struggle for independence, when the revolutionary aspect of the khadi industry far outweighed its economic aspect. Obviously, we cannot develop the khadi industry today by emphasizing its revolutionary character. It can only become a force in society if we develop its economic character. I would like to stress the fact that this

can only be done if we approach the khadi and village industries in a new way and recognize the fact, too, that they must now develop under the impetus of their own strength and not cling too much to help from the Government.

I should, however, like to warn the khadi workers that they must not become dogmatic. They should for ever keep an open mind and be receptive to modern ideas. With a new approach and outlook, they could revitalize and regenerate the entire industry. Even the khadi and village workers will have to adjust themselves to this fast changing world and consider how best they can use new technical and scientific methods in developing their industries.

I would advise the various khadi and small industry organizations not to feel helpless and not to blame the Government for the static position of the industries. No organization with such an outlook can ever forge ahead. The faults of others are always there to criticize but we must look to our own first.

It has been suggested that khadi be used by the Army and in government offices. I wonder whether khadi can be of much practical use to a soldier who has to crawl on the ground or make his way through thick jungles. Some State Governments have objected to adopting khadi on the ground that it would increase their expenditure. As I have already stated, there cannot be much progress if these industries depend entirely on government assistance.

However, on behalf of the Government, I pledge my fullest support to the Board in its task of developing khadi and village industries in the country. Such a Board should have been set up four years ago. Although I am surprised at the delay, I am glad that at least a beginning has been made. When the Board was about to be constituted, some of my friends suggested that I, in my capacity of Prime Minister, should be closely associated with it. I approved of the idea but I was told that there were certain rules and regulations forbidding the Prime Minister to have personal association with such organizations and institutions and in any case the inclusion of the Prime Minister in such a Board would have

had only publicity value. I, therefore, wrote to the sponsors that I would not like to be directly associated but that I would give it all the help I possibly could.

ON KASHMIR

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

THE HOUSE will remember that a few days ago I made a fairly lengthy statement in this House about the affairs of Jammu and Kashmir State. I do not propose to weary the House by a repetition of what I said then. But at this stage, I should like to emphasize certain aspects of this problem.

For the last five years nearly, the Kashmir problem has been one of the heaviest burdens that the Government has had to carry. It has been a heavy burden because it was a complicated affair and one in which our saying 'aye' or 'nay' was not quite enough. Other factors were involved. There are many things in this world which we would like to change but we cannot shape the world to our will. We live, as the House well knows, on the eve of what appears to be a tragedy in the world and we try—when I say 'we' I do not mean we in this House but people all over the world—to avert the tragedy and somehow to assure peace for this world. But nobody can control events completely. Of course, one tries to mould them to certain extent, tries to affect them in some way; but what the ultimate resultant of the various forces and passions and prejudices at work is likely to be, no man knows. The misfortune of the State of Jammu and Kashmir and our misfortune have become a part—perhaps a small part but, nevertheless, a part—of the larger picture of the world. And therefore the difficulties in our way have increased greatly. It is an international problem and would have been an international problem anyhow if it concerned any other nation besides India—and it does. Its international character was further emphasized because a large number of other countries took an interest in the problem and gave advice.

Well, we have tried to fashion our actions in regard to this problem according to what we considered to be our obligations and responsibilities. What were those obligations and responsibilities? The first was to protect and safeguard the territory of India from every invasion. That is the primary responsibility of the State. Secondly, it was our duty to honour the pledge we gave to the people of Jammu and Kashmir State. And that pledge was a two-fold pledge. We were obliged to protect them from invasion and rape and loot and arson and everything that accompanied that invasion. That was the first part of the pledge. The second part of the pledge was given by us unilaterally and was to the effect that it would be for the people to decide finally what their future was to be. The third was to honour the assurances we gave to the United Nations and the fourth was to work for a peaceful settlement. That was not a pledge we had given to anybody but one that was implied in the policy we had tried to pursue right from the beginning. It is in the nature of things that we should pursue a policy of peace, since we are wedded to the ideals of peace. Apart from that, it was necessary that we should do so because the world in which we live appears to be on the edge of a precipice and one has to be very careful in taking any step which might, perhaps, cause the world to tumble over that precipice.

So, these were the four major considerations that we had to keep in view and sometimes it was difficult to balance them. Sometimes they seemed to lead in different directions. It would have been an easy matter if all these factors had led us to the same conclusion. But since they pulled in different directions, our obligations and responsibilities lead us to think not only of one line of action but of several. Then, difficulties arose. Well, we have faced these difficulties and we have sometimes had a hard time deciding what we should do and what we should not do. I should like the House, therefore, to think in terms of balancing these very important assurances, pledges and the other factors in the situation.

In the course of these years, I have repeatedly placed the situation before this House and it is with the concurrence and

support of this House that we have continued to pursue the policy that we have pursued. It has been my belief that, in this matter more than in others, the great majority of the people of this country have approved of our policy. We have had evidence of this approval from time to time in this House and in the House that preceded it. We have received advice from innumerable people, friends and critics in this country and we have always welcomed that advice, even though some of it did not appear to be feasible or right. We have also received advice from innumerable people outside this country. We welcome their advice, too, when it is friendly advice. We do not welcome it when it comes from unfriendly minds or is accompanied by threats or any hint of threats.

We took this matter to the United Nations four years and eight months ago, in the belief that thereby we were serving the cause of peace and in the hope that we would settle the question of Kashmir by means of an agreement. We have not settled it yet, in spite of the labours of the United Nations and its various organs. I would like to repeat what I said on the last occasion in this House when I paid a tribute to Dr Frank Graham, who has shown enormous patience and enormous perseverance in his pursuit of a peaceful settlement. So far as we are concerned, we shall help him to the end, even though people may get tired of our pursuing the same path. Peace is always an ideal worth pursuing, however tired we may get in the process. Many of our colleagues and friends in the country have perhaps got weary of this process and I can very well understand their weariness; but their weariness can hardly compare with the weariness of those who are in charge of the Kashmir affair. Day after day, week after week, month after month, we have had to carry this heavy burden. However weary we may have become, we dare not act in a hurry, we dare not act in anger, we dare not allow ourselves to be led by passion. The consequences of acting in passion are always bad for an individual; but they are infinitely worse for a nation. Therefore, we have restrained ourselves. We have restrained ourselves even when loud cries of war and loud threats have reached us from across the border. We restrained ourselves and I am glad to say that, generally speaking, our

people and the press in this country also restrained themselves. I have great sympathy and understanding for those who sometimes felt that we should do something more active and throw off restraint: but I was sure then and I am sure now that it would have been utterly wrong to do so. I am not referring to any minor step here and there but rather to the major trend of the policy that we pursued. We must keep these four major obligations in our minds as we have done in the past, even though we have put the matter before the United Nations. Some friends have advised us to withdraw it from the United Nations. I am not quite sure if they have studied this subject or considered how it is possible to withdraw this or any such matter from the United Nations; unless, of course, we withdraw ourselves from the United Nations. The United Nations concerned itself with this matter at our instance. And, in any case, if we had not brought the matter to the United Nations, others might have done so. If we say, 'we withdraw from the United Nations,' we shall only be showing impatience and temper without achieving the results that some people hope we will. Therefore, the question of withdrawal from the United Nations does not arise, unless, of course, this House wishes that the Government of India and the Union of India itself should withdraw from the United Nations. In the latter case, the House must be prepared to face all the consequences of such an action. I presume that the House does not wish this, just as I do not wish it.

I have ventured, in all humility, sometimes to criticize those developments at the United Nations which seemed to me to be out of keeping with its Charter and its past record and professions. Nevertheless, I have believed and I do believe that the United Nations, in spite of its many faults, in spite of its having deviated from its aims, somewhat, is, nevertheless, a basic and fundamental thing in the structure of the world today. Not to have it or to do away with it would be a tragedy for the world. Therefore, I do not wish this country of ours to do anything which weakens the gradual development of some kind of a world structure. It may be that the real world structure will not come in our lifetime but unless that world structure comes, there is no hope for this

world, because the only alternative is world conflict on a prodigious and tremendous scale. Therefore, it would be wrong for us to do anything that weakens the beginnings of a world structure, even though we may disagree with this particular organization and even though we may sometimes criticize it, as we have done. It is mainly for these reasons that I fail to understand this cry about our withdrawing the Kashmir dispute from the United Nations. It is not like withdrawing a case from one law court and taking it to another. The United Nations is not to be considered merely a forum dealing with the Kashmir question. The question is before the nations of the world, whether they are united or not and whether they are a forum or not. It is an international matter and a matter which is in the minds of millions of men. How can you withdraw it from the minds of millions of men? Surely not by a legal withdrawal. The question does not arise. We have to face the world; we have to face our people; we have to face facts and we have to solve problems.

Some friends seem to imagine the easiest way to solve the question is to have an exhibition of armed might. They say, 'Let us march our armies.' That can never be a solution in this case or in any other case. The more I live and the more I grow in experience, the more convinced I become of the futility and the wickedness of war as a means of solving a problem. I consider it my misfortune that we even have to spend money on armaments and that we have to keep an army, a navy and an air force. In the world as it is constituted today, one is compelled to take those precautions. Any person in a position of responsibility must take these precautions and if we take them, we have to take them adequately and effectively. Accordingly, we must keep a fine army, a fine navy and a fine air force. That is so. But to think in terms of throwing our brave men into warfare is not something I indulge in, unless circumstances force my hands as they forced my hands on a late evening in October 1947. It was only after the most painful thought and consultation that I decided upon our course of action. If I may say so in all humility and without sacrilege, I did so after consulting the Father of the Nation.

People say, 'A part of the territory of India has been invaded. It is held by the enemy. What are we doing to defend that territory of India? We have failed in our defence.' Such statements would be perfectly justified; such criticism of the Government would be legitimate to some extent. It was and is our duty to push out the enemy from every invaded part of the territory of India. That is where the conflict between obligations and responsibilities really begins.

As the House knows, we decided right at the beginning that we were agreeable to a plebiscite in which all the people of Jammu and Kashmir State would take part. It was a curious thing that in spite of having so decided, this war should have continued. The war continued for fourteen months or so—from the end of October 1947 to the end of 1948. It was for us to decide at the end of 1948 or the beginning of 1949, whether we should carry this war on to the bitter end and thereby recover the lost territory or whether we should call a halt to active military operations and try some other and more peaceful method. We decided and, conditioned as we were, I submit we decided rightly to put an end to active military operations and try other methods. These other methods have not brought a solution in their train thus far. And yet, I think it would be right to say that the mere fact that an extraordinarily explosive situation, such as the one that has existed in the State of Jammu and Kashmir for the last few years, has been controlled is itself no small achievement. We see in other parts of the world how other countries have got more and more entangled in all kinds of morasses and how the path of war becomes more and more difficult. We had the courage and, I say in all humility, the wisdom to pull ourselves out of continuing an unending war before it was too late, so that we might think more calmly, more patiently, more wisely. Whether it has yielded any result yet or not, the fact remains that we have not been having a war for the last three and a half years or so. This is not a bad result, although it may not be a satisfactory solution.

Later, we declared that any further aggression or attack—I say 'any further' because there had been aggression and

aggression was continuing—or military operations in regard to Kashmir would mean an all-out war not only in Kashmir but elsewhere, too. That decision was not lightly taken but after serious thought and careful consultation. We said it knowing full well the consequences of what we said. We had weighed the consequences and yet had come to that conclusion. It was no threat but the statement of what was, to our minds, an absolute fact. There could be no further attack on Kashmir without this matter becoming a major war so far as India was concerned. Having made that perfectly clear, I think we succeeded in preventing many an attack that might have taken place in the hope that the aggressors would get away with it.

Two or three basic things follow from this. One is that, in so far as the United Nations is concerned, we shall continue unless this House decides to the contrary, to deal with it in the manner in which we have done in the past. We have tried our utmost to achieve a peaceful settlement without giving in on any vital point or trying to evade any of our responsibilities or obligations. We have resolved not to dishonour the pledges we have given to the people of Kashmir or to the people of India and, therefore, we shall pursue our policy accordingly.

The House is aware that we accepted certain resolutions of the United Nations and of the UN Commission that came here. We accepted them, not because we liked everything about them but because in our earnest desire for a peaceful settlement, we were willing to go to great lengths. Nevertheless, we made it perfectly clear that we would not by-pass the pledges we had given or the responsibilities we had undertaken. At a much later stage, another resolution was passed by the Security Council which tried to impose an arbitration on us. We rejected that resolution or that part of it which was objectionable to us. It was one thing for us to agree to a certain proposal after having weighed all the consequences but we could not possibly give up our responsibilities, pledges and assurances; we could not put the matter in the hands of somebody else, whoever he might be. We could never do that because we had our own duties

and obligations to consider. How could we hang the faith of the four million people of Jammu and Kashmir State on the decision of an arbitrator? Great political questions—and this was a great political question—are not handed over in this way to arbitrators from foreign countries. That is why we had to reject this particular resolution of the United Nations. We stand by that rejection and are not going to agree to anything which prevents us from honouring the pledges or the assurances we have given.

Subject to that, we shall go all out to seek a peaceful settlement. Among the assurances and pledges that we have given is the pledge which was implied in our policy, namely, that the people of Jammu and Kashmir State would decide their future. Let me be quite clear about this. There still seems to be a good deal of misunderstanding about Kashmir's accession to India. The other day, I said in this House that this accession was complete in law and in fact. Some people and some newspapers, mostly newspapers abroad, seem to think that it is only something that has happened in the last week or fortnight or three weeks that has made this accession complete. According to my views, this accession was complete in law and in fact in October 1947. It is patent and no argument is required, because every accession of every State in India was complete on these very terms by September in that year or a little later. All the States acceded in three basic subjects, namely, foreign affairs, communications and defence. Can anybody say that the accession of any State in India was incomplete simply because they acceded in only those three subjects? Of course not. It was a complete accession in law and in fact. So was the accession of the Jammu and Kashmir State, in law and in fact, by the end of October. It is not open to doubt or challenge. I am surprised that anybody here or elsewhere in the world should challenge it. I was telling the House that when the first United Nations Commission, accompanied by their legal advisers and others came here, it was open to them to challenge it. But they did not, because it was quite clear to them and to their legal advisers that there could be no question about the legal validity of the accession. So, while the accession was complete

in law and in fact, the other fact which has nothing to do with law also remains, namely, our pledge to the people of Kashmir—if you like, to the people of the world—that this matter can be affirmed again or cancelled by the people of Kashmir according to their wishes. We do not want to win people against their will and with the help of armed force; and, if the people of Jammu and Kashmir State wish to part company with us, they can go their way and we shall go ours. We want no forced marriages, no forced unions. I hope this great Republic of India is a free, voluntary, friendly and affectionate union of the States of India. The people of Jammu and Kashmir State not only agreed to come to us as they did but it was at their request that we took them into our large family of States. I do believe that they have the same friendly feelings towards us as the other States have. I believe that on repeated occasions they have given evidence of this fact. Even in the election of this Constituent Assembly that took place nearly a year ago, they exhibited that feeling of friendship and union with India. I am personally convinced that if at any time some other method of ascertaining their feelings is decided upon, they will decide in the same way. But that is my personal opinion; it may not be your opinion or the House's opinion. The fact, however, remains that we have said to them and to the world that we will give them a chance to decide. We propose to stand by their ultimate decision in this matter. Within the limits of these assurances and pledges, we shall continue to pursue the policy that we have decided upon.

A short while ago, we met the representatives of the Government of Kashmir and they were not merely the representatives of the Government but, undoubtedly, the popular leaders of the people of Kashmir. We met them, we talked to them and we discussed many matters with them. We did not go to them in a bargaining spirit or in a spirit of opposition. We discussed matters with them, with a view to solving our intricate problems, with a view to unravelling the knots and with a view to finding some way which would fit in with the various assurances that we had exchanged and with the policies they stood for and we stood for. Many of

these policies were, of course, common to both. I placed the agreements we arrived at before this House on the last occasion. It is obvious that these agreements are not a final solution. Much has still to be done; much has to be thought out. But two or three facts remain. One is that, in the nature of things at the present moment, it is necessary to consider the case of Jammu and Kashmir State on a somewhat different footing from the other States in India. This is inevitable because Kashmir has become an international issue in the last few years. A different footing does not mean any special right or privilege except in the sense that it may mean a greater measure of internal autonomy. It is a developing, dynamic situation. One may gradually change it more and more but it is not right for us under the existing circumstances to try to do something by mental coercion or by pressure of some other kind. That would defeat our object and that would, indeed, be playing into the hands of those who criticize us.

OUR PLEDGE TO KASHMIR

I MUST EXPRESS my gratitude to the many hon. Members who, in the course of this debate, have spoken generously about the policy that the Government has pursued in regard to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. While we have had an abundance of generous acknowledgement of our policy, we have had criticism also. I welcome the latter, because it is always helpful in understanding a particular position. In this very difficult and delicate matter, criticism will be especially helpful, because the more aspects we examine the more light will be thrown upon the problem.

We have dealt with this matter for nearly five years now. We have fought on the battlefield for over a year and many of

our brave young men have gone to Kashmir and remained there. We have fought this fight in many a Chancellery of the World and in the United Nations; but above all, we have fought this fight in human hearts—the hearts of the men and women of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. With all deference to this Parliament, I would like to say that the ultimate decision will be made in the minds and hearts of the men and women of Kashmir and not in this Parliament or at the United Nations. We have dealt with the problem of Kashmir in a variety of ways in various fields of action. We have not, however, solved it, although we have made progress in a particular direction. I want to be perfectly frank with this House and promise no speedy solution. Why should I make promises which I might not be able to keep? And may I remind this House that there are numerous problems today, big problems, affecting the world's future which remain unsolved, which drag on from month to month and year to year without solution? One has to be thankful if these problems do not grow worse. That itself is supposed to be a great mercy and a blessing. It is all very well for people in foreign countries to say, 'Why don't you solve this question of Kashmir? It may lead to big things, perhaps, to a world conflict.' Many people in foreign countries are generous with their advice. One feels tempted to tell them that they also have vital problems to solve, whether it is in the Far East or in Europe or elsewhere and that their problems also somehow drag on from year to year. Why do they not find a solution to these before offering advice to us? How is it that we are at fault because we cannot solve the question of Kashmir while they, who censure us, are above reproach, though they fail to solve their problems? Not only do their problems remain unsolved but preparations are also made to create problems for the future. Anyhow, this would be a cheap reply for us to make to them, because we are all in difficulties; we are all struggling against things which, perhaps, are not entirely within the control of any one country or any one people.

I should like this House to continue to consider this problem as it has been considered in the past, that is, in all

its aspects, forgetting for the moment the minor things, the lawyer's points if I may so call them with all respect to lawyers. The latter certainly have their place, provided they keep it. My honourable friend, Dr Mookerjee, has said a great deal about this clause and that clause. If I have the time I shall deal with the points he has raised but it is of little importance what this clause or that clause says. What is important is the way you approach the problem and its fundamental basis. It is also important what your objective really is and how you propose to gain it. If it is your objective—as I shall claim it should be, for there can be no other—that this problem must be decided by the people of Kashmir then you must adopt a policy by which that end can be gained. Why issue threats? Why talk to them and tell them they must do this or must not do that? I am called a Kashmiri in the sense that ten generations ago my people came down from Kashmir to India. That is not the bond I have in mind when I think of Kashmir but other bonds which have tied us much closer. These bonds have grown much more in the last five years or so. When I talk of my ties with Kashmir, I am only a symbol of the vast number of people in India who have been bound together with Kashmir in these five years of conflict against a common adversary. First of all, let me say clearly that we accept the basic proposition that the future of Kashmir is going to be decided finally by the goodwill and pleasure of her people. The goodwill and pleasure of this Parliament is of no importance in this matter, not because this Parliament does not have the strength to decide the question of Kashmir but because any kind of imposition would be against the principles that the Parliament upholds.

Having come to the conclusion that the future of Jammu and Kashmir State can ultimately be decided only by the people of Jammu and Kashmir, let us fashion our other policies accordingly and let us not find fault with every little thing because it does not fit in with our wishes. Many things have happened in Jammu and Kashmir which I do not approve of; but there it is. I have no doubt many things have happened and will happen that neither my honourable

friend on the Opposite side of the House nor I will approve of, just as many things happen in the rest of India that I do not approve of. I do not control everything that happens in India. But what is our approach going to be? Whatever it is, we must not do anything which will counter it or undermine it or uproot it and which will encourage the hands of those who are opposed to us—our enemies. That is the basic thing which we must understand. Let us be clear about it. You can criticize Sheikh Abdullah. Sheikh Abdullah is no god. He commits many errors and will commit many more. He is a brave man and a great leader of his people. That is a big enough thing. He has led his people through weal and woe and he has led them when they were facing grave disaster. He did not shrink from leadership at that time—that is a big enough thing to be said about any man. If he has failings, if he has made a mistake here and there, if he has delivered a speech which we do not like, what of that? Bigness is bigness in spite of a hundred mistakes. And in any case, the question is not whether we like Sheikh Abdullah or not. It is a bigger matter than any individual.

The question of Kashmir, as this House well knows, certainly has not been for us a question of territory. Financially, we gain nothing from it. On the contrary, it may cost us a good deal until the State ultimately develops; and it is bound to develop because it is rich in resources. Nevertheless, we have not cast covetous eyes upon Kashmir or hoped for any gain. We have cast eyes on Kashmir because of old bonds, because of old sentiments and new sentiments also. Kashmir is very close to our minds and hearts and if by some decree or adverse fortune Kashmir ceases to be a part of India, it will be a wrench and a pain and torment for us. If, however, the people of Kashmir do not wish to remain with us, let them go by all means; we will not keep them against their will, however painful it may be to us. That is the policy that India will pursue and it is precisely because India stands for such a policy that people will not leave her. People will cleave to her and come to her. Our strongest bonds with Kashmir are not those that are retained by our Army or even by our Constitution to which so much reference

has been made but those of love and affection and understanding and they are stronger than the Constitution or laws or armies.

Many of the arguments that some hon. Members of the Opposition have advanced seem to me to be inapplicable. It is easy to criticize many things that have happened in Kashmir. It is natural that one should want to better certain things but that is a different matter altogether. The question is whether in doing so you are coming nearer your aim or being an obstacle in the way of your very objective. The hon. Member who spoke last is a representative—much more so than I am—of a minority community of Srinagar, the Kashmiri pandits. He gave you a graphic account of the days when everybody in the Valley of Kashmir—Muslim or Hindu but more especially the Hindus and the Sikhs—lived in terror of what the morrow might bring. Nobody knew what would happen or, perhaps, they knew too well. The people of Kashmir, especially the women of Kashmir, have a great reputation outside Kashmir also. The women of Kashmir, both Hindu and Muslim, were taken away in considerable number by the raiders and others, sometimes as far as Afghanistan and even beyond. There are cases where these women were sold for a mere pittance. Hon. Members should try to understand how these stories and these accounts must have affected the people of Kashmir, how they must have lived in fear lest their own mothers, sisters and wives should suffer a similar fate on the morrow. It must be recognized that the people of Kashmir have lived through fire and have faced it; they did not run away from it.

Looking back at these five years, I think that the people of Kashmir, the people of India and, if I may say so with all humility, the Government of India have stuck to the right path in spite of numerous small mistakes that they may have made. We have pursued the policy we considered right even when it appeared most inopportune; sometimes our attitude displeased certain people; sometimes a little swerving to the right or to the left would have gained us an advantage in foreign countries—and foreign countries had begun to count for us. It did not matter much what we thought of them;

but there they were, sitting in the Security Council and talking a great deal. Sometimes they talked sense; at others they did not. We had to put up with their attempts to judge us and to judge something which was so important to us. Kashmir was not important to us because of any territorial designs on our part as somebody suggested but for the other reasons that I have mentioned. People in other countries thought of Kashmir merely as a geographical unit. It was only a plaything for them while it was very much in our hearts. Our history and our circumstances had made Kashmir so closely associated with our feelings, emotions, thoughts and passions that it was a part of our beings. Certain foreign countries tried to deal with the Kashmir question in a casual way and talked of India's imperialism and her territorial designs. We restrained ourselves but very often there was anger in our hearts—anger at this intolerant criticism, at the presumptuous way in which people talked to us, to this great country of India. They had the audacity to talk of imperialism to us when they were imperialists themselves and were carrying on their own wars and themselves preparing for future wars. Just because India tried to protect Kashmir from territorial invasion, people had the temerity to talk of India's imperialism!

Well, as I said, we restrained ourselves and we shall still endeavour to restrain ourselves in future but restraint does not mean weakness. It does not mean giving in. We were firm and convinced of the rightness of our position because, as I said—and I said it in all honesty—I have searched my heart and looked into every single step I have taken in the matter of Kashmir but cannot find that any of the major steps we have taken has been wrong. Although it is my Government that is ultimately responsible for the part India has played, I have been personally concerned with every single step taken during the last five years. Of course, in retrospect, there are things that I could have done differently—some minor things—but I do not see how any major step we have taken could have been taken in a way other than in which it was done. When we sent our young men flying over the mountains to Kashmir at the end of October 1947,

there may have been a miscalculation; but it was fundamentally a right step demanded by circumstances. We may have erred sometimes because we were anxious to preserve peace and to avoid war at all costs; but I would always like to err in that way. For people to accuse us of avarice or covetousness, of imperialism, of breaking our word and pledge, is grossly unfair. I have said before and I repeat that every single step we have taken has had conviction behind it, every single word or pledge we have given to the United Nations or to the United Nations Commission or to anybody else who has come here has been kept to the letter and every single assurance has been carried out. All this is much more than can be said for Pakistan in this matter, because the entire Kashmir business is based on a fundamental lie—the lie Pakistan has told in denying that she invaded Kashmir. If Pakistan wants Kashmir, let her go there and fight. But why lie about it? The armies of Pakistan were in Kashmir for six months and then they denied the whole thing. When you base a case on a lie, the lie has to be repeated; and it was repeated in the Security Council month after month. Their armies were still in Kashmir and their Foreign Minister went on saying that they were not there. That was an astonishing thing. When the United Nations Commission was here and was on the point of going to the front and when there was no possibility of concealing this fact any longer, they admitted it. They had to admit it and a statement was submitted by the Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistan army who was a well-known British Officer. The statement was to the effect that he had been compelled, in the interests of protecting Pakistan, to send his armies—the Pakistan armies—into Kashmir. He was afraid that India was going to invade Pakistan across Kashmir from somewhere in Central Asia!

That was the beginning of the extraordinary story of Kashmir and it is as well that it is repeated again and again, because people are apt to forget it. This matter has become international and is talked about in the various capitals of the world. This simple story, these simple facts of invasion, of brigandage, loot and arson are forgotten and passed over

casually while other discussions take place. It has been an amazing education for many of us these five years: education in world politics, education in how nations can behave, education in how great countries get distorted vision and cannot see straight in the simplest matter when it so suits them. Perhaps, I am talking a little beyond my present brief. To come back to the future of Kashmir, I want to stress that it is only the people of Kashmir who can decide the future of Kashmir. It is not that we have merely said that to the United Nations and to the people of Kashmir; it is our conviction and one that is borne out by the policy we have pursued, not only in Kashmir but everywhere. Though these five years have meant a lot of trouble and expense and in spite of all we have done, we would willingly leave Kashmir if it was made clear to us that the people of Kashmir wanted us to go. However sad we may feel about leaving, we are not going to stay against the wishes of the people. We are not going to impose ourselves on them at the point of the bayonet.

Of course, this does not mean that we are prepared to do what we consider wrong if the people of Kashmir should desire it. If they want us to do something wrong in Kashmir, we shall refuse to do it. We may even say, 'We would rather not have any association with Kashmir than have the wrong kind of association.' That is certainly conceivable. Nobody can force on us an association we do not want just as we cannot remain in Kashmir against the will of the people: An association is a matter of mutual understanding and affection, it is a voluntary union of parties who wish to have ties with each other. In our desire to gain the goodwill of the people of Kashmir, we cannot afford to provoke the ill-will of our own people. We are not considering this matter as a bargain or as a matter between strangers. We are almost a part of each other and are considering a difficult and delicate problem together as partners in order to try and find a way out. The way out may not be completely logical; it may not be completely reasonable from the point of view of this law or that constitution; but if it is effective, then it is a good way out.

I should like to say one more thing in this connection

although it is, perhaps, not to the point. I am afraid of saying it because there are so many lawyers here. When the British left, there was a good deal of misunderstanding about the situation that was created in India by the Partition and because of the statement about the Indian States issued by the United Kingdom. I shall venture to put forward my own view, functioning, for the moment, as a jurist and a constitutional lawyer. The Partition took away a certain part of India with our consent; but the rest of India, including the States, remained as a continuing entity. Till something happened to separate the States from India they were a part of India. We were not created by partition as Pakistan was. India was, India remained, India is, India will be. So, every State, till it arrived at a decision to the contrary, would continue to have the old relationship with India.

By the removal of the British power from India in 1947, we were, to some extent, thrown back to the days when the British first came. That is an interesting and good parallel to pursue in other ways, too; but I shall not pursue it, because it may lead to controversial matters. When the British power established itself in India, it became evident that no other power in India could remain independent. Of course, these powers could remain semi-independent or as protectorates or in some other subordinate capacity. Accordingly, the Princely States were gradually brought under the domain and suzerainty of the British power. Similarly, when the British left India, it was just as impossible for old bits of Indian territory to remain independent as it had been during their regime. At that time Pakistan was, of course, out of the picture. For the rest, it was inevitable that the princes and others, whoever they might be and whether they wanted it or not, must acknowledge the suzerainty of the sovereign domain of the Republic of India. Therefore, the fact that Kashmir did not immediately decide whether to accede to Pakistan or to India did not make Kashmir independent for the intervening period. Since she was not independent, it was our responsibility as the continuing entity to see that Kashmir's interests were protected. I wish to say this, because it was undeniably our duty to come to Kashmir's aid,

irrespective of whether she had acceded to India or not. On account of the continuing entity, India's responsibility to all the other States remained unchanged except in the case of those that had definitely and deliberately parted company.

The word 'monarchy' has been used a good deal. I do not understand in what sense it was used. We have no monarchs in India. I understand the meaning of the word 'monarchy' but it does not apply in the present case. I do not know why such words should be employed unless the aim is to delude us. There are some persons who, by the generosity of our States Ministry, are still called 'rulers.' I do not know why, because they rule nobody. Our States Ministry in the last three or four years has been known for its generosity and I am afraid we shall suffer for that generosity for a long time to come.

There is no monarchy in India. In certain places there are princely families who have unnecessarily large endowments. They hope to live on these endowments for generations to come. There are also a few Rajpramukhs. At the moment, we have three States that are headed by Rajpramukhs; in some instances, there are groups of States and one of the ex-rulers has been chosen to be Rajpramukh for life.

Some of the Rajpramukhs are, undoubtedly, excellent people; others are not quite so excellent. It is true that the idea of giving tenure to a person in a responsible office for life is not entirely in keeping with modern thought. One must remember the particular context of events and not be too critical of what was done. When this step was taken, hundreds and hundreds of States had to be absorbed into India within a few weeks. At that time, a number of princes might well have given a lot of trouble; in fact, some were on the point of giving major trouble. Some did give trouble secretly. When our other troubles came, some of these princes and their families and cousins and uncles did a lot of harm and injury by giving money and guns to gangs of rowdies to go about creating mischief.

That was the position: there were hundreds and hundreds of independent States in India, which were uncertain of their future, afraid of their own people, afraid of the Government

of India and left in the lurch by the protecting hand of the British power. We could have decided many things at that time. We could have decided, if you like, to remove them completely from the scene or to come to terms with them and buy immediate peace in a moment of grave peril to the country. It is very well for us to be wise after the event but I think Sardar Patel acted very wisely. There was great danger that India might go to pieces under the stress and strain of the passions raised by the Partition, the huge killings all over the country and the communal atrocities. The reactionary *jagirdari* and feudal elements threw themselves into the picture just to create trouble and disruption and in the hope that they could enlarge their domain in the general confusion. It was foolish of them to hope that; nevertheless, that is how their minds worked. In such circumstances, one had to take a decision. Chiefly Sadar Patel and partly all of us arrived at the decision that it was better to consolidate India rapidly, even though it cost a great deal of money, than to let wasteful fratricidal warfare and disturbances continue. Apart from other things, even from the point of view of cost, the latter would prove to be more costly in the long run, besides leaving a trail of bitterness. Therefore, we made certain rapid settlements which, financially or otherwise, were hardly fair; but this was the price we had decided to pay for the quick settlement of a very difficult and vital problem.

I shall not go into the details of how we propose to deal with these matters in future. Obviously, such matters will have to be dealt with in a friendly spirit because what happens in one place undoubtedly has its reactions and repercussions in another. What is happening or is likely to happen in Kashmir is bound to have its reactions elsewhere.

The honourable Dr Mookerjee also referred to Article 352. He said a great deal about it and asked me whether certain other articles dealing with financial chaos or emergency and with the breaking down of the Constitution would be applied in this case. I shall answer him. At present, we are not applying those articles. We have not even put them forward for consideration. I would beg the House to remember that we have to proceed on the basis laid down

by that stout builder of our nation, Sardar Patel. At the time our new Constitution was being finalized, the question of Kashmir came up and was dealt with in Article 370 of the Constitution. I would ask the hon. Member to read Article 370, because if he discusses this question now, he must do so on the basis of the Article which had been agreed upon and which is a part of the Constitution we have given ourselves.

It is true, as has been pointed out, that the Article in question was not a final and absolute provision. That Article itself was a transitional one. But it laid down the method of decision in the future. It laid down the mode of procedure and prescribed the manner in which additions could be made to the subjects. Altogether, there were two classes of subjects. One related to the three major subjects or rather to the three categories of subjects, namely, defence, communications and foreign affairs. If any change was to be made in the interpretations of these, the President was to do it in consultation with the Kashmir Government or the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir. In regard to the other subjects, the words used are "with the concurrence of" and not "in consultations with."

Why, then, should anybody complain that we are going outside the Constitution, that we or the people or the Government of Kashmir are committing a breach of the Constitution? It may well be that the Government of Kashmir will ask us to do something which we do not consider proper. In that case, it only remains for us to talk to each other and find a way which both consider proper. If we fail to arrive at an agreement, then, of course, that thing cannot be done and the consequences have to be faced. The consequences may not be agreeable to them or to us but there is no other way. There is no question—as some of the amendments of hon. Members seem to imply—of our issuing some kind of decree or sending a compulsory order. I do submit that we have approached this matter and we shall always approach this matter in a spirit of friendship because we have to remember that there are many aspects to this question, both external and internal. The internal aspect is at present the responsibility of the Kashmir Government.

The activities in that part of Kashmir which is called 'Azad' Kashmir—wrongly so, since it is under Pakistan—have an effect on other countries. Foreign countries naturally have an effect on India and so on. There are so many aspects to the problem that you just cannot look at it from your own point of view only. It may be that the people of Kashmir have a particular aspect in view which you have not considered. It is possible that you may be convinced if you consider it. Dr Mookerjee complained that he was not consulted about certain things. Surely, Dr Mookerjee will not expect Sheikh Abdullah or a member of this Government, in the course of important talks, to be constantly consulting others. It is impossible; it cannot be done. Apart from those who had a particular commission in connection with this matter, even the members of my Cabinet were consulted only after the talks were over. Sheikh Abdullah was anxious to meet the Members of the Opposition. He did not have the advantage of meeting Dr Mookerjee but he did meet his colleague, Mr Chatterjee, and he had a two-hour talk with him. I was not present at the talk but Mr Chatterjee was good enough to write to me and inform me that he had been influenced by what Sheikh Abdullah had told him. He further said that he now realized that there were many aspects which had not been put before him earlier.

I should like to refer to Article 352 which deals with the proclamation of emergency. It reads as follows: "If the President is satisfied that a grave emergency exists whereby the security of India or of a part of the territory thereof is threatened, whether by war or external aggression or internal disturbance, he may, by Proclamation make a declaration to that effect...."

In a sense, the President can do all manner of things, including taking charge of the whole State. What we suggested and agreed upon in these talks was that where there was a reference to internal disturbances, this action should be taken with the concurrence of the Government concerned and that such concurrence was not necessary in case of aggression or war. Undoubtedly, that is a variation in favour of that Government and hon. Members are

entitled to criticize it. Will hon. Members kindly recall the basis from which we started? We start from Article 370 for the present moment. Article 370 rules out Article 352 and all the other articles. That is to say, at the present moment, keeping strictly to the Constitution as it is applicable to Kashmir State, none of these provisions apply. So that, all we have said in regard to the Supreme Court or to the President's other powers, is new and must be included in the Constitution of Kashmir. The supremacy of the President or this Parliament or Supreme Court only applies to Kashmir to the extent to which they accept it. It is not as though we were giving away something. We have very specifically laid down this very important provision of the Constitution, that the President can take charge of the whole State itself under a grave emergency. This should apply to the State of Jammu and Kashmir except in the case of internal disturbance, when the concurrence of the Government of Kashmir is necessary. This seems very odd and some people say, 'How can you ask or wait for their concurrence?' It is not really such an odd provision; because when the whole State is in a chaos, then nobody waits for anybody's concurrence and the necessary steps are taken. The particular phraseology of the Article is taken from the American Constitution, where the Federal Government can take charge of the State in an emergency with the concurrence of the State Government. Undoubtedly, it is open to hon. Members to criticize this; but there is nothing very odd or very special about it and, in the circumstances, we felt that it was better for us to accept this form rather than none.

The fact that we have been considering these provisions, whether they are emergency provisions or they concern the President's special powers or Parliament's powers in a certain domain or the Supreme Court, is surely an indication as to where sovereignty lies. I am, perhaps, being rash; but I am talking about the Constitution and legal matters. Obviously, in a federal constitution, federal sovereignty is divided between the Federal Centre and the States. In a moment of crisis, however, sovereignty may vest with the Federation or Centre. I see that the Law Minister apparently does not

agree. I am not quite sure but whatever the case, it is a small matter. Whether sovereignty is to be divided or not in a Federation is an old argument.

I started with the presumption that it is for the people of Kashmir to decide their own future. We will not compel them. In that sense, the people of Kashmir are sovereign. They are not sovereign in the sense that they cannot accept the Constitution and then break it. They cannot enter into a partnership with us and accept that part of our Constitution over which we are sovereign and then try to evade it. But they are sovereign in the sense that they may accept the whole or reject the whole; or they may come to an agreement with us on particular matters that they do not want to accept along with our Constitution.

I have taken a lot of time and I hope the House will forgive me for it. In a few days, my colleague, Mr Gopalaswamy Ayyangar, will be leaving for Geneva. I will not be very truthful if I say that I expect great things to happen; but we have to carry on with the rough and the smooth of it and not run away from it. Our good wishes go with him but, above all, our good wishes should go to the people of Jammu and Kashmir State, who have become the plaything of international politics and even of our debates.

WE CANNOT BE ENEMIES FOR EVER

SIR, AS THE House is aware, this debate on the President's Address is a new departure and we have no conventions to guide us in the matter. This new Republic must make its own conventions. I have followed this debate and we as the Government have welcomed and will always welcome opportunities when hon. Members can criticize the Government or express their opinions about the various activities of the Government. But I have noticed that, in the course of this discussion, a large number of matters have been raised; in fact, the discussion has been, to some extent, on the lines of the normal budget discussion.

Now, it is not for me, Sir, to limit the discussion in any way or to restrict it but I would suggest certain things for your consideration and for the consideration of the House. The essential nature of this debate at the beginning of the session is to give an opportunity to the Opposition in the House to raise major questions of policy, in fact, to raise something which is tantamount to a vote of no confidence by the House. A new House or a new Government or a Government meeting in a new session, naturally wants to give an opportunity to the House to decide then and there whether it approves of that Government and its major lines of policy or not. If, instead of that, we have a debate on a large number of minor issues, the major issues are obscured and the principal object of such a debate is, therefore, not served. There is, of course, a difficulty in this House as the Opposition is numerically very small and it is, therefore, right and fair that some latitude should be given.

There are one or two relatively small matters to which I shall also refer right at the beginning. One or two hon.

Members of this House complained that a sufficient number of women have not been returned to the House. Although that is not a matter which concerns Government policy, I would like to express my entire concurrence with that complaint and my firm opinion that women have not been given a fair deal in this country. Further, in future, it will be a matter of serious consequence to this country and to this House as to whether a sufficient number of women are returned or not. May I add that in the experience we have had in regard to the appointment of women in our delegations to foreign countries as well as in appointments made by the United Nations itself, I cannot think of a single instance where the appointment has not justified itself? I can, however, think of many instances where appointments of men have not been justified. Speaking from a good deal of experience, I can tell this House that women, who have gone abroad in our delegations and for other work, have, each one of them, raised the credit of India and left a good impression wherever they have gone.

My friend, the hon. Mr Tyagi, took exception to the ceremonial that was observed when the President came in. He thought that it was too English and that we should have conches or some other ancient instrument blowing when he came in. Whether he meant it seriously or not, I do not know; but it does raise an interesting point for the consideration of this House. We are anxious to have our own customs and our own ceremonials in India. When we adopt a certain practice or ceremonial which comes from foreign countries, I suppose, it has a certain meaning. Both in our Constitution and in our judicial system, we have very largely followed the practice of foreign countries and more especially that of the British Parliament. Would the hon. Member, who complained, like us to have armies after the model of the Mahabharata and use weapons which were used five hundred years ago? I say this because there is a tendency in this country to support obscurantism in the name of nationalism. We often seem to confuse the great things of the past with its minor trappings. There is thus the danger that the great things may suffer while the minor trappings flourish. There-

fore, we must be careful in these matters. India suffered enough in the past by being caught up in the minor trappings. India became a slave country because she did not keep pace with the world. If we forget that lesson today, we shall fall back again. Nationalism is a great and vital force and, if we give up any part of the genius of our people and the basic traditions of our people, we lose a great deal thereby; we become rootless. At the same time, nationalism often covers a multitude of sins and a multitude of things that are dead and gone. What is communalism after all? In its very essence it is a throwback to a medieval state of mind, medieval habits and medieval slogans. Let us, by all means, preserve every single Indian custom and every Indian way of thought; only, let us not go back to something that has no relevance to the modern world. The President came in. There was no blowing of trumpets. Does Mr Tyagi object to people walking in step? Does any hon. Member object to military officers accompanying our President? Does the hon. Member object to our military officers wearing the uniform they had on? Does he expect them to go about in the dress I am wearing today or in the dress some hon. Members are wearing?

The President will come again. The President will come accompanied by his ADCs and military officers. If the ADCs and military officers are to accompany the President, are they to wear special military uniforms? Is our Army to put on a different uniform? One has to think about these things. We can and we should consider what new customs should we introduce anything that stands for aloofness and sloppiness, the bane of this country, which leads inevitably to inefficiency and many other evils? We live in an age where we have to be efficient, whether it is on the political, economic or any other plane. I admit that, in many ways, the Government ought to be more efficient but you cannot expect efficiency to rise as Phoenix out of the ashes in an inefficient environment.

I think it was my friend Mr Tyagi who said that we should have a government of revolutionaries. I should very much like to know what his definition of a revolutionary is,

since a revolutionary has been defined in many ways. In the old days, revolutionary activity was normally defined as activity directed against the foreign Government. At a time when we had to oppose a foreign imperialistic government, this was understandable. There, too, there may be a difference of opinion, for a man may take to the bomb and call himself a revolutionary, although his action may actually be counter-revolutionary in terms of the true mechanics of revolution. Yet, by a strange misuse of language, a bomb-thrower has been called a revolutionary. Now that the foreign Government is gone, we are facing other problems. What is the test of revolution now? Many of the people, who were previously revolutionaries in the old sense of the word, are no longer revolutionaries in its modern sense. In fact, some of them may actually be classed as reactionaries. In fact, because a person has been a revolutionary during the British regime, it does not necessarily follow that he is a revolutionary today. Take the communists, for instance. They were our colleagues for some time. Today, they are following an anti-social policy of destruction and sabotage; and yet they were revolutionaries once. There are others, too, who do not oppose us on the political plane but on the economic plane. Indeed, how many views there are on the economic plane! It is, therefore, not easy to call a man a revolutionary without knowing how to define the term.

We had to make an attempt to lower the prices of basic necessities, especially food. We could not afford to take the slightest risk because anti-social people would profit by it. It is a dangerous thing to play about with the food crisis. However, these are matters for careful consideration by the Government and by this House.


Now to come to the issues of foreign policy. It is clear that there has been very little criticism of our foreign policy except in so far as it applied to Pakistan. I would like to say that the record of our foreign policy, in the two and a half years since we attained independence, is a very satisfactory one, judged by the status of the nation in international affairs. There is no doubt that, for a variety of reasons, India's reputation in international affairs is high. We have adopted, as the

House knows, a policy which has been described as one of neutrality or non-alignment. I dislike the word 'neutrality' because there is a certain passivity about it and our policy is not passive. Why we are criticized as sitting on the fence or as siding with this or that group, I do not quite understand. A country's foreign policy ultimately emerges from its own traditions, urges, objectives and, more particularly, from its recent past. India is being powerfully affected by her recent past. We were laying down the basis of our foreign policy even when we were opposing the British Government during the last twenty or thirty years. I submit that within the limits of a changing situation, we have tried to follow that policy. It seems to me extraordinarily presumptuous on anybody's part to ask me to join this or that bloc. Is my country so small, so insignificant, so lacking in worth or strength, that it cannot say what it wants to say, that it must say ditto to this or that? Why should my policy be the policy of this country or that country? It is going to be my policy, the Indian policy and my country's policy.

It is true that no policy can be viewed in isolation. We co-operate with other countries and we seek the co-operation of others. We have our likes and dislikes. In regard to our likes, they help us to co-operate; but in regard to our dislikes, they come in the way. Indeed, we tone down our dislikes deliberately because we want to be friendly with other countries.


We see that the world today is blinded by fear and hatred. It is an extraordinary situation and it is becoming more and more difficult for countries to take an objective view of any subject or problem. This enveloping fear and hatred lead them to violence and war. What it will ultimately lead to, I cannot say. I still think it possible that grave disasters and catastrophes might be avoided for the world, not by the efforts of India alone but also by enlisting the aid of earnest people of goodwill in other parts of the world, who think likewise.


Whatever the consequences of another war may be, it is dead certain—and it is terrible to contemplate—that in every country and in every part of the world most things



At the Central Fuel Research Institute, Jealgora, April 1950

Visit to a coal mine in Bihar, April 1950






Addressing a gathering at Cochin, June 1950




Giving away prizes to winners in a children's painting, drawing and writing competition organized by a Delhi weekly



*Addressing the Indonesian Parliament at Djakarta
during his visit to Indonesia, June 1950*



*With President Soekarno of Indonesia, driving
through the crowded streets of Djakarta*



With the British Prime Minister Mr. Clement Attlee and other Commonwealth Prime Ministers at the Commonwealth Conference held in London in January 1951

that we value in life will vanish. Whether you call yourself a communist, a socialist or any other 'ist,' you cannot let the very basis of progress and civilized existence be destroyed for a whole generation or more. Of course, some third or fourth generation may be able to arise from the ashes of that war but any person who thinks at all earnestly must come to the conclusion that every effort must be made to prevent this great catastrophe overwhelming the world.

I am not so vain as to imagine that any efforts on the part of our Government will make a great difference to world affairs. Yet, every little effort counts and, in any event, I do not see why our efforts should not be in that direction and why we should take for granted that war is inevitable and give up all attempts to prevent it. This, therefore, is the aim of our foreign policy.

Some hon. Members criticized our association with the Commonwealth of Nations. May I beg the House or those Members who object to it to dissociate this question from past sentiment? I do feel that it is the past sentiment that governs them more than the present situation. Presumably, some people imagine that our association with the Commonwealth imposes some kind of restricting or limiting factor upon our activities, be they political, economic, foreign, domestic or anything else. That impression is completely unfounded. In the case of the United Nations or the International Monetary Fund, some limiting factors certainly come in, as they must, if we join an international organization of that type; but in our association with the Commonwealth, there is not the least vestige of such a limiting factor.

As the House well knows, this is not a constitutional issue; it is in the nature of a gentleman's agreement between the countries of the Commonwealth which we entered into deliberately and after serious thought because we felt that this relationship was to our advantage.

I think an hon. Member said something about devaluation. Whether devaluation was good or bad has nothing to do with our membership of the Commonwealth. We may carry out any policy we like regardless of whether we are in the Commonwealth or not. When people think of the

Commonwealth influencing us in our policies, may I suggest to them the possibility that we may also greatly influence others in the right direction?

Then, a reference was made to countries like South Africa whose policy brings them into conflict with us in the various phases of our activities. Questions are often asked of me: 'Did you consider the South African issue or the Pakistan issue at the Colombo Conference and elsewhere?' My answer invariably is that we did not, because we do not deliberately want to make the Commonwealth Conference a kind of tribunal or a kind of superior body to decide our issues. We are all independent countries dealing directly with one another. The House knows that our membership of the Commonwealth has made no difference whatever to our dealing with the South African issue. If we go out of the Commonwealth, it will not make much difference to our policy, except, perhaps, that it might, in some ways, become slightly easier for us to deal with each country in the Commonwealth on a reciprocal basis.

Apart from the general reason, namely, that there is absolutely no object in our breaking an association which might help and certainly cannot hinder and which helps in the larger context of world affairs, there is one major reason for our remaining in the Commonwealth and that is that a very large number of Indians live abroad in what are called British colonies or dependencies. I am not talking about the self-governing or independent countries of the Commonwealth but about other places. By our remaining in the Commonwealth, these Indians are in a better position than they would be otherwise. In the latter case, they would have to make a sudden choice and break with India or with the country where they reside. Had we left the Commonwealth it would have put millions of our people in a very difficult position, quite unnecessarily.

Coming to our relations with Pakistan, many hon. Members have expressed the opinion that we have been too gentle, that we have been indulging in appeasement or that we have not been firm enough and so on. Well, it is not easy to consider a vague indictment of this kind. One can

discuss specific matters and give an answer. It is also not easy, because in the very delicate state of relations between India and Pakistan during the last two and a half years, everything that has happened does not see the light of day. We don't shout from the house-tops about what we do and, therefore, all the facts are sometimes not before the public. I do not, however, wish to take shelter behind that plea. Most of the facts are before the public and before this House. I should like the House and hon. Members—if not now, at a later stage—to tell me what they think should or should not be done about any specific matter. The vague idea of 'being firm' does not help.

The partition of India was, from every point of view, a very unnatural thing. Well, we accepted it, we continue to accept it and we will act accordingly. But as the President said in his Address, it inflicted such wounds on the vast masses of people in India and Pakistan as would take some time to heal.

Some hon. Members have often pointed out that Pakistan employs wrong methods and does not follow a straight policy. I agree. But would hon. Members suggest to this Government that it should also not follow a straight policy in regard to Pakistan? I want that question to be considered and answered, because I am quite convinced in my mind that whatever policy Pakistan may follow, we should not follow a crooked policy. I say that, not merely on grounds of high principles but from the point of view of sheer opportunism. If I have gained any experience in the last thirty or forty years of my public life or if I have learnt any lesson from the Great Master who taught us many things, it is this, that a crooked policy does not pay in the end. It may pay temporarily.

I do not mean—how could I—that any Member is suggesting such a policy but there are people and organizations outside the House who do suggest it and that is why I referred to it. Some of the things suggested by bodies like the Hindu Mahasabha seem to me the stupidest of things. But there is a market for stupidity and cupidity in this country. I, therefore, want to make it perfectly clear that these

suggestions, which according to me are crooked suggestions and come out of crooked minds, will not be accepted by us, whatever the consequences. It is not so much to this House that I am addressing myself as to the people outside who irresponsibly say things which affect our foreign policy and which give cause to the people on the other side of the frontier to create more trouble.

We are a great country and this House has great authority over matters of State, both domestic and foreign. What this House says or what an hon. Member in this House may say is carried to far countries and this is how other people judge our country. Therefore, we must speak with a great deal of responsibility. Our lightest utterance may have a special meaning for other countries. I try, in spite of the failing on *my part to talk rashly at times, to restrain myself*. I have tried to speak with as much moderation as I can on matters concerning Pakistan and other countries. I am convinced that we must be strong and firm in our policies and preparation, be they military or other; we must not give in on any point we consider wrong, whatever happens: but our attitude should, at the same time, be restrained, moderate and friendly. Whether it is possible to combine the two or not, it is difficult to say. Anyhow, that is my training and that was the training we received even when we were fighting a powerful imperialism and risking everything in that fight: not to bow down to evil but to be firm with it, not to compromise with it or stoop to its own level but to prepare to meet it on every front and, at the same time, be gentle in our conduct and moderate in our language. Perhaps, some hon. Members may sometimes mistake our soft language or our moderate approach for lack of firmness. Why not examine our actions—whether they are in the plains or in the mountains of Kashmir—and study them?

May I beg of you to consider here that we are facing a new situation, at any rate, a new development, to which an hon. Member drew attention yesterday? The exodus from East to West Bengal is increasing. I agree that is a bad thing and everything should be done to check it and to help those who come over. But behind it lies something much bigger. If

this kind of thing goes on, obviously it may lead to disastrous consequences. Should we, in a moment of anger, say or do things which precipitate further crises and further disasters? I submit to this honourable House that a responsible government should not do that. It should, of course, take every effective step. But shouting aggressively is not such a 'step.' Unfortunately, the old traditions of diplomacy have been forgotten in the modern world. Diplomacy in the olden days may have been good or bad but people at least did not curse one another in public. The new tradition today is to carry on publicly a verbal warfare in the strongest language. Perhaps, that is better than actual fighting but it leads to fighting or rather may lead to fighting.

I, therefore, submit that, in our relations with Pakistan, we have first of all to follow a policy of firmness and adequate preparation but always to maintain a friendly approach. Again, there can be no doubt that India and Pakistan, situated as they are geographically and otherwise and with their historical background, cannot carry on for ever as enemies. If they do, catastrophe after catastrophe will follow; either they will wipe each other out or one will wipe the other out and suffer the consequences, which is unthinkable. We are passing through trouble and crisis, largely due, in my opinion, to a certain fund of hatred and violence accumulated during the days before Partition. We have inherited this legacy and we must face it. Let us forget the Governments—our Government and the Government of Pakistan—and think of the millions of people who live next-door to one another. At some time or other, those millions will have to come together, will have to co-operate, will have to be friends. There is no doubt about it. Let us think of that future which may not be very distant and let us not do things today which may lead to generations of rivalry and conflict.

We have, as the House knows, offered to make a joint declaration with the Government of Pakistan for the avoidance of war. Some hon. Members may think that it is a gesture of weakness. Well, I am sorry if they think so, because it is, in fact, a gesture of strength. We know exactly to what

limit we are going to permit things to go. We have made that offer, because we are convinced that, if it was agreed to, it would lay the foundations for a gradual, if not sudden, improvement and for the settlement of various questions. I do not want hon. Members to think lightly of a question which they want solved by war. I can understand war in the context of defence. I don't wish to think of war in the context of aggression and I want to make this point perfectly clear on behalf of myself and my Government.

We have, indeed, fallen far below what might be called the Gandhian ideology but it still influences us to some extent. And, anyway, it is not a question of ideologies at all; it is a question of looking at the world today with clear eyes. As the House remembers, Mahatma Gandhi once spoke warningly of the countries of the world looking at one another with bloodshot eyes. There is something fateful about that sentence. He said, "Keep your eyes clear." So, I try as far as I can, to keep my eyes clear when I look at the scene, whether it is India or the world scene or the relations between India and Pakistan; for bloodshot eyes bode nothing good, no clear thinking and no clear action. An hon. Member implied that people grow weak because they don't have bloodshot eyes or because they don't urge one another on to war all the time. That is not only a wrong policy but a policy of despair.

If we can maintain a certain state of mental preparedness only by strong drinks and intoxicating words, we must obviously succumb when we do not have them. Therefore, it is well to be prepared for all contingencies, whether military or any other. It is well to be firm and not bow down to evil. But it is also well always to be conciliatory and always to stretch out your hand to those who will grasp it; because, though their Government may not do so, the people will always grasp an outstretched hand, not only the people of a particular country but the people of all the countries of the world.

A PLEA FOR BALANCE

FOR SOME TIME past I have been greatly concerned with developments in East Bengal and their repercussions in West Bengal. I have followed these events with anxiety, which my colleagues have shared with me. These developments in East Bengal have brought unhappiness and misery to large numbers of people, many of whom have been forced by circumstances to migrate to West Bengal. Apart from the human misery involved, the situation is full of danger. The Government of West Bengal and the Government of India, fully conscious of this danger, have given the situation earnest thought and taken such action as they consider necessary. It is obvious that we cannot control the happenings in East Bengal except by consultation with the Central Government of Pakistan and the Government of East Bengal. We are, of course, wholly responsible for what happens on our side of the border. We have, therefore, taken appropriate steps and been in constant consultation with the Pakistan Government on these issues.

Events caused certain repercussions in Murshidabad District which were speedily and effectively handled by the West Bengal Government. Meanwhile, other developments have taken place in certain parts of Calcutta, which have added to the gravity of the situation. I would like to make an earnest appeal to the people of Calcutta to help in controlling the situation and bringing it back to normal in every way they can. Whatever action we take towards this end, disturbances in Calcutta or elsewhere cannot help us. Above all, we must avoid attempts at retaliation because they are not only morally wrong but also harmful in that they weaken the effect of any action we might take. I can well understand the strong feelings that have been roused by the gruesome accounts brought from East Bengal by the refugees and others. We share those feelings. But action should not flow from emotion alone. In order to be effective and firm, it has to be calm, well thought out and based on right principles.

Otherwise, that action is not only ineffective but also injurious to the very cause for which it is taken. In trying to solve one problem, we should not give rise to other and more difficult problems. On no account must we fall a prey to communal passion and retaliation. The problem of Calcutta and West Bengal is not only a provincial problem but an All-India one and the burden of solving it must rest with the whole of India. In this matter, differences in political approach do not or should not count. All political progress depends upon certain fundamentals, such as an ordered and tolerant society. An ordered society faces those who seek to injure it with firmness and effectiveness. If that basis is lost, then all the anti-social elements will have free play.

I would, therefore, appeal to the citizens of Calcutta and the people of West Bengal, including the refugees who have come over from East Bengal, speedily to put an end to all manifestations of disorder and to help in bringing normality to the life of that great city. Only then can we face these new problems, as we have faced the old, with all our combined strength, keeping in view the objectives and principles for which we have stood and by which alone we can make our country great.

THE BENGAL ISSUE

FOR SOME TIME now, especially during the last two weeks, the country has been in the shadow of tragedy. The atmosphere of suspense has been further heightened because accurate news was lacking and all kinds of rumours were afloat; and, often greatly exaggerated statements were made. The Government, responsible for dealing with the situation developing in Bengal, has had to bear a heavy burden. For the moment, all other issues, however important, took a second place. The Government explored every possible avenue in dealing with this situation. I must apologize to the House for not giving much information on the subject earlier;

but the very gravity of the situation and the absence of accurate news led me to postpone making a statement. I was anxious not to say anything that might turn out to be inaccurate or help in aggravating a situation which was bad enough already.

The press in India, as elsewhere, has its faults. Some periodicals are particularly irresponsible. I should like to say, however, that during the last two weeks, the Indian press has exercised commendable restraint and I am grateful for it. Unfortunately, I cannot say as much for the Pakistan press. I was amazed to read accounts and comments in the Pakistan press which were not only grossly exaggerated but often fantastic in their untruth and violent in their appeals to passion and bigotry. Ever since the trouble started, it has been our earnest desire to find out the facts because it is not possible to understand the situation, much less to deal with it, without knowing what has actually happened or is happening. Even today, we are making every effort to induce the Government of Pakistan to co-operate with us in finding out the truth about the trouble, both in West and East Bengal. We do not want an elaborate enquiry. All we want is accurate information about the existing situation so that both the Governments might adopt adequate measures and deal with it. It must be realized that, left to itself, the evil we are facing is likely to continue and its possible consequences are too appalling to contemplate.

We deplore greatly what happened in Calcutta when it was the scene of trouble. I think it can be said with truth that this trouble was dealt with promptly and effectively. We appreciate the firmness and impartiality with which the Chief Minister of West Bengal dealt with the situation in Calcutta. Calcutta is a big city and any one who wishes may go there and see things for himself; but East Bengal is very different in this respect and news travels slowly. A kind of iron curtain fell on East Bengal during these days and accurate information did not come through except in dribbles.

The problem before us is much too serious for any one of us to seek to make political capital out of it, for it affects the future of tens of millions of people both in India and Pakistan.

I have endeavoured, therefore, to exercise as much restraint as I could and to view the situation objectively. I have little doubt that what has happened in East Bengal is far more serious than what happened in Calcutta and one or two other places in West Bengal. The two can hardly be compared with any fairness. In any case, it is important that we know the facts.

I shall, therefore, give the facts that have come to our knowledge. For months past, persistent anti-India and anti-Hindu propaganda has been carried on in East Bengal. The press, the platform and sometimes the radio have been used to incite the masses against the Hindus in East Bengal. The latter have been called 'kafirs,' 'fifth-columnists,' 'a danger to our State' and so on. Similarly, virulent propaganda, mostly in regard to Kashmir, was carried on in West Pakistan, too. Hatred and violence and war were preached in the name of religion.

On December 20, 1949, an incident occurred in the village of Kalshira in the Bagerhat sub-division of Khulna District in East Bengal. A police party went to arrest an alleged communist. Failing to find him, they started to assault the inmates of his house, including the women. Attracted by the cries of the women, the neighbours ran to the scene and a free fight between the police party and the villagers followed. A policeman was killed on the spot and another died of injuries subsequently.

Two days later, the police, assisted by the Ansars and some rowdy elements, attacked not only that village but twenty-two others inhabited mostly by members of the Namasudra community. There was arson and looting on a large scale; men were murdered and women ravished. There were also forcible conversions and places of worship were desecrated. The residents of the unfortunate village could not escape because of the rigid cordon maintained by the armed police and others. Even the news of the attack could not come through. About three weeks after this occurrence, some of the afflicted people in the villages managed to evade the cordon and cross into West Bengal. Immediately, the West Bengal Government drew the attention of the Government

of East Bengal to this grave situation and asked for information. This enquiry brought no reply and the personal letter written by the Chief Minister of West Bengal to the Premier of East Bengal remained unanswered. In spite of obstructions, the migration from the Khulna area to West Bengal continued and up to February 14, men, women and children numbering 24,239 had left the affected areas.

Incidents somewhat similar to these took place at Nachole in Rajshahi District in East Bengal, an area largely inhabited by the Santhals. Following a clash between the police and the Santhals, many villages were ravaged. By February 3, 700 Santhal families had crossed over to West Bengal.

The presence of all those refugees and their stories of ill-treatment shocked and excited the public in West Bengal. As a result, some isolated incidents took place in Murshidabad and in two or three villages nearby. The situation, however, was rapidly brought under control. There were no deaths and only a few people were injured. There was also a small exodus from West Bengal, although the exact figures are not known at present.

The refugees from Khulna and their accounts of what they suffered created considerable excitement in Calcutta and, as a result, a series of incidents took place on February 4. There were stray assaults on the Muslims and a number of their *bustees* were burnt. The police took immediate action and made arrests on every occasion. The situation improved and no incidents were reported on February 6 and 7. On February 8, two Hindus were stabbed in front of a mosque in Ultadanga in North Calcutta. This led to a recrudescence of the trouble and arson and looting took place in certain Muslim localities. There were also cases where Muslims were stabbed. The police were given orders to shoot at sight any person looting or stabbing or committing arson, while a curfew was imposed in the affected areas. Military patrols were on constant duty. From February 10 onwards, the disturbances were greatly reduced in volume and were ultimately fully controlled.

Owing to these disturbances, there was considerable panic in some of the Muslim areas of Calcutta and a number

of Muslims left their houses for other parts of Calcutta, notably the Park Circus area. According to a house to house census, 26,112 persons moved to other parts of Calcutta, although subsequently a large number of them returned to their houses.

The actual casualties in the Calcutta and Murshidabad areas were as follows:

Calcutta area (up to February 17)

			<i>Hindus</i>	<i>Muslims</i>	<i>Others</i>
Injured	83*	123	..
Deaths	11	20	..
Arrested	979	91	6

*16 were injured by police-firing.

Rest of Bengal, including Howrah (up to February 19)

			<i>Hindus</i>	<i>Muslims</i>
Injured	27*	23
Deaths	5†	14
Arrested	360	75

*12 were injured by police-firing.

†One was killed by police-firing.

On February 9, a conference between the Chief Secretaries of East and West Bengal took place at Dacca. On February 10, while this conference was still going on, there was a demonstration inside the Secretariat at Dacca. The employees of the East Bengal Secretariat marched to Victoria Park in procession. After the meeting held there, rioting, looting, murder and arson broke loose all over the city of Dacca and continued till the next day. On February 12, a crowd of Hindu passengers was attacked at the Karimtolla airport near Dacca by an armed mob and a large number of intending passengers, including women and children, were killed or seriously wounded. This tragedy took place within a stone's throw of the Karimtolla military headquarters and in the presence of Pakistan armed guards.

It is not possible for us to know exactly how long these disturbances continued in Dacca or to give accurate figures about deaths or other mishaps. Estimates of deaths in Dacca city alone vary between a thousand and six hundred.

It is still more difficult to obtain facts about the mofussil areas in East Bengal. But it is clear that there have been disturbances in several widely spread towns like Narayanganj, Chittagong, Feni, Rajshahi, Barisal and Mymensingh. No correct information has been supplied by the East Bengal Government about these incidents, although it was agreed at the Chief Secretaries' Conference that there should be mutual exchange of authenticated information. Passengers who have flown from Calcutta to Dacca and back have reported that they saw burnt out houses in the villages along the route. For some days, refugees from East Bengal were not allowed to come to West Bengal. Passengers in trains were taken down at intermediate stations and the arrival of empty trains in West Bengal caused a fresh spate of rumours and excitement. Later, these restrictions were removed to some extent but even then injured persons were not allowed to cross over.

The figures for evacuation, both by train and air, from East Bengal to West Bengal and *vice versa* are as follows:

From Dacca to Calcutta by air between			
February 12 and 21	About 3,500 persons
By train from East Bengal to Calcutta			
between February 13 and 20	16,000 ..
Total		..	19,500 ..
From Calcutta to Dacca by air between			
February 12 and 21	2,100 ..
From Calcutta to East Bengal by train			
between February 13 and 20	3,000 ..
Total		..	5,100 ..

A very large proportion of the Hindu population of

Dacca went into improvised camps soon after the trouble arose. These camps were, however, exceedingly unsatisfactory. Many of these people have now returned to their homes. According to the latest figures received, 7,200 are still in these camps in Dacca city and 10,000 have been given shelter in private houses in Hindu areas.

We have received a large number of telegrams, letters and other accounts from individuals who have come from various parts of East Bengal, giving particulars of ghastly occurrences. I have refrained from mentioning these, for, usually, people who have been through great ordeals cannot give a correct account of their experiences and are apt to exaggerate. Such figures as I have given above have been checked and are likely to be near the truth. It seems to me clear, however, that many parts of East Bengal have been the scene of bitter tragedy.

The Government received the first reports of the Khulna incidents on January 20. Further reports showed that the situation was a serious one and that large numbers of refugees were coming to West Bengal. Protests were repeatedly lodged with the Government of Pakistan but with no results. Since the trouble began in Dacca, the Government tried to be in constant touch with the West Bengal Government and with its Deputy High Commissioner in Dacca. Our Deputy High Commissioner, however, was not in a position to give any first-hand information for some time, because, on the advice of the Pakistan authorities, he did not go out of his house. Meanwhile, hundreds of refugees had taken shelter in his office.

On February 17, I sent a telegram to the Pakistan Prime Minister suggesting that every facility for visiting the troubled areas and ascertaining the facts be given by both Governments to the Deputy High Commissioner of the other Government. Such facilities, I might mention, have already been accorded to the Deputy High Commissioner of Pakistan in Calcutta. The Pakistan High Commissioner was also in Calcutta for some days. I further suggested to him that there be a rapid survey of the situation in the two Bengals by two fact-finding Commissions, each consisting of two representa-

tives nominated by East and West Bengal respectively, of whom one would be a Minister. I expressed the hope that these Commissions should start functioning within a week. Also, I communicated to the Prime Minister of Pakistan some reports which we had been receiving about events in East Bengal.

On February 18, I received a reply from the Pakistan Prime Minister. He agreed to give facilities to our Deputy High Commissioner to visit areas alleged to be affected. Regarding the proposal to send joint Commissions, he said that he would consult the Government of East Bengal. He suggested further that the two Governments should issue a declaration that they did not favour—and would do everything possible to discourage—any movement of refugees.

On February 20, I telegraphed to him again pressing for the acceptance of my suggestion for joint fact-finding Commissions. In another telegram, I pointed out the gravity of the situation and suggested that he and I should visit the affected area together. This was to be in addition to the joint fact-finding Commissions. I have just received a reply to these telegrams. The Prime Minister of Pakistan says that in his opinion no joint Commission is necessary or desirable. He also thinks that if he and I were to tour East and West Bengal jointly, it would produce no useful result. He further believes that our High Commissioners will be able to supply full information after enquiry. He adds that according to his information the situation has become normal.

Our High Commissioner in Karachi has gone to Dacca. I might mention that our Deputy High Commissioner at Dacca wanted to proceed to Barisal to study the situation there. The East Bengal Government has informed him that it has to consult the local authorities before it can give a definite reply and that this will take four days. It thus appears that even the agreement to permit our High Commissioner and Deputy High Commissioner to visit various parts of East Bengal is not being honoured.

The Chief Minister of West Bengal made an offer of sending relief parties to the camps in Dacca with medicines

and other supplies. The East Bengal Government has expressed its inability to accept it.

It seems to me essential and imperative that the true facts should be known. Charges and counter-charges are made and excitement and passion go on mounting. In the circumstances, it is not enough for each Government to issue its own version of the facts. It was for this reason that I had made certain suggestions to the Prime Minister of Pakistan which he rejected. I still think that the fullest opportunities for investigation must be provided on each side. We have been and are prepared to give these opportunities. In addition to the proposal I have made, I am suggesting that representatives of the International Red Cross, accompanied by Ministers or officials of each Government, should visit the affected areas in each province.

I hope to keep the House informed of developments in Bengal. We are in constant touch with the West Bengal Government and with our Deputy High Commissioner in Dacca. Gradually, more facts are coming to our knowledge and it becomes clear that a major tragedy has occurred. It is, indeed, the duty of both the Governments to restore normality and to give succour to those who have suffered. I can say that the Government of West Bengal has endeavoured to do this duty with a large measure of success.

While the present situation is serious enough and demands constant attention and action, the future problems that it raises are exceedingly grave. People talk vaguely of exchange of population but from any point of view such suggestions are totally unrealistic. Tens of millions of people cannot be uprooted and transported to distant places. It is true that in the Punjab migrations took place on a vast scale, bringing infinite suffering in their train. They took place because we were face to face with elemental forces and two newly formed Governments had suddenly to face a crisis. There is no such excuse now and both India and Pakistan should have the strength and capacity to discharge their primary function of giving security and confidence to their people, whoever they might be. It is not our desire to interfere with the domestic affairs of Pakistan. But it would be idle to

say that we do not feel sympathy and anxiety when large numbers of people in Pakistan have to undergo suffering and indignity in an extreme form. We have all along discouraged any migration and we wish to do so still. But if terror-stricken people come to us for refuge, we cannot say 'no' to them or refuse to give them the help they need. India and Pakistan may have become two different countries, separate from each other politically and in other respects; but large numbers of people live in one country who have intimate associations and relationship with people in the other. When in trouble, these people look to each other for shelter and help.

It seems clear to us that a very large number of people, if not all, belonging to the minority community of Pakistan have lost all sense of security and live in fear and apprehension. It is the bounden duty of Pakistan, as it is ours, to inspire confidence in the minorities so that the nationals of each country can live peacefully and practise their normal vocations. If a government is unable to inspire that confidence and its own citizens are compelled by circumstances to take refuge in some other country then that government has failed to discharge its duty.

Apart from the humanitarian, there is another aspect of this problem which affects us. Communal bitterness in one country inevitably has repercussions in the other. If tragedies are enacted in Pakistan, they powerfully affect our people and we cannot remain indifferent to them. It is for the Government of Pakistan to consider seriously what the consequences are likely to be, if it is unable to give peace and security to its own people.

The present situation provides an incentive to evil-doing. There is thus not only false propaganda to incite people but also opportunity for the evil-doer to indulge in loot and arson and to get away with it, even profit by it. If a government is serious about checking this evil it must punish the evil-doer and compensate the sufferer.

I should like to make an appeal to our own people in this grave moment of crisis. If they desire that the Government should take effective action whenever necessary, they must realize that perfect order and security must prevail in India.

There are anti-social elements and communal groups who, in spite of their declared opposition to communalism, really function in tune with the intense communalism that prevails in Pakistan. These elements have to be checked, because they bring disrepute to our people and weaken the country. Because of the very seriousness of the situation, we must remain calm and determined and not indulge in loose language or action, which is improper and harmful.

India has to face many serious problems. Among them is the problem of Kashmir. The House knows how much importance I attach to the latter, because behind it lie vital questions of principle and moral behaviour among nations. To me it appears that what has happened in Kashmir and what is happening in East Bengal is inter-linked and cannot be separated. We want peace in this country and with Pakistan and I have made this point repeatedly. But peace and goodwill cannot come by any superficial arrangement when the deep-seated causes of trouble and conflict continue. Today, the Bengal problem has first priority, because it governs so many other problems. For my part, I would like to devote myself chiefly to the particular issues of Bengal and Kashmir which, as I have said, are linked together in my mind. If the methods we have suggested are not agreed to, it may be that we shall have to adopt other methods. I am deeply troubled by recent events and my mind is constantly trying to find out how best I can deal with these issues and discharge my duty to my country and my people.

MEETING THE CRISIS

SIR, I am loath to take up more of your time but I feel I owe it to the House and to myself to say a few words to elucidate my previous statement. What I said seems to have provoked an hon. Member of this House, Mr Lakshmi Kanta Maitra,

Reply to debate on the budget demand for the Ministry of External Affairs in Parliament, New Delhi, March 17, 1950

to speak in terms of high emotion and excitement and righteous indignation. I want to make it perfectly clear that I have no complaint against Mr Lakshmi Kanta Maitra. Being at times prone to emotion and righteous indignation myself, I appreciate it in others. Nevertheless, I feel that his indignation and emotion today were misplaced. Or it may be that I did not explain my point of view clearly enough.

Mr Lakshmi Kanta Maitra spoke with a great deal of feeling about the happenings in East Bengal. He spoke of the numerous letters and messages he had received about the sufferings and the indignities people had to endure. I may not have access to all the sources from which Mr Lakshmi Kanta Maitra derived his knowledge but I am also aware of the horrible things that have happened there. I happen to hold a responsible position and my decisions are not merely expressions of opinion but may have to be translated into action. Therefore, I must be careful that at this moment I am not led away by emotion, excitement or indignation. Normally, I speak without having to keep a tight hold of myself. In this instance, however, I dare not allow myself to go because the responsibility and the consequences are too grave. That does not mean that I am unaware of what has happened; it is because of the very nature of the crisis, the depth of it and its far-reaching consequences that I hesitate to speak in unrestrained language.

The burden of what I said was this: in the course of the last two and a half years there has followed what may be called a 'squeezing out' process, especially in Sind and in East Bengal. Some people say it is not deliberate or planned. Some people say it is not deliberate at the top but is so at the bottom or in the middle. Be that as it may, the main thing seems to be that in the Pakistan Government's conception of the State, an inferior status is given to those who do not belong to the majority community. This, along with other things that have happened, gives the minorities a feeling of insecurity. And this widespread sense of insecurity tends to exaggerate anything that happens, thereby creating an atmosphere of suppression. Thus, what might otherwise be an isolated incident is transformed into a dangerous situation.

I also said, in sufficiently clear language, that apart from the normal responsibilities of a State to other States or to people in other States, a peculiar relationship exists between the people in India and the people in Pakistan. I mentioned, in this connection, our old colleagues in the Frontier Province. I also mentioned very specially those who are in East Bengal and said that we could not rid ourselves of the feeling of the ultimate responsibility we have for them. They may be in danger and we owe it to them to give them protection either in our territory or, if circumstances demand it, in their own. It is patent that, in the existing state of affairs, any protection they get in their territory can only come to them through the Government controlling that territory. That Government functions as it pleases and according to the circumstances in which it is placed. We can, of course, exert friendly pressure on the Pakistan Government to do certain things in a certain way but we cannot act independently of it. We cannot ignore it. The word given by a government has two kinds of values. The first is positive and has an effect on its own people and other people, whether you trust it or not. Secondly, it serves as the initial move from which subsequent steps follow. An hon. Member, Mr Hanumanthaiya, talked of an exchange of population. With all deference to him, I can say that, if he had given more thought to the problem, he would not have spoken as he did. This approach is completely devoid of intelligent thinking. I was amazed that any one should talk such utter nonsense. I am sorry to have to say this but it is a serious matter and people must not indulge in loose talk.

A solution like the one that was suggested is not a solution at all because in the best of circumstances it will take at least half of a quarter of a generation to accomplish this. A solution that will keep you hanging for years is of little use. No country can survive if it remains at boiling point year after year. We have kept the door open and people can come and go. When they come, it is up to us to make arrangements for them; but, however fast they come, large numbers must still remain behind. We cannot tolerate any danger coming to those who remain behind, wherever they are. That has got

to be our main consideration. How, when and in what manner, we can achieve this purpose is quite another matter and one that is not easy to decide. But to suggest that we bring them over, even though we may have to spend the next ten years in the process, is folly. During these ten years, all kinds of disasters and dangers may beset us. The moment we decide to get the minorities in Pakistan over, no matter how long it may take us, we will have to overhaul and change our past policy and principles completely. Not only that; from that moment the danger will also increase, because the people concerned will become aliens and have hardly any rights. They will just be waiting year after year to go over to the other side till transport is arranged; and all this while, they will have no rights except those of bare protection. That does not sound like a very happy solution of the problem. If it were so easy to accomplish this, we would go ahead but we have to watch carefully and go step by step. In so doing, we have to keep our heads, for this is a serious matter affecting not only our kith and kin today but also future generations and, perhaps, the whole future of India. Therefore, it is a terrible responsibility.

I spoke this morning about the hydrogen bomb and I said that it was something that could destroy mankind. It amazes me that some people should talk lightly of it. I have felt for some time that, however disastrous the hydrogen bomb may be, it is, nevertheless, preferable to the kind of thing we have seen and heard of here in recent months. Let the world be utterly destroyed but let us not continue to live as brutes and beasts, ever sinking to lower levels. That is a challenge to the generation, a challenge to this House and to this Government. Are you going to fight the spread of beastliness and the barbarism that is overcoming us? You cannot fight evil with evil; you cannot fight barbarism with barbarism. You have to take up a civilized position and resist brutishness with all your might. Of course, we feel strongly about the people of East Bengal but we must realize our responsibility to them and in helping them try to find ways and means which are civilized and which adhere to the ideals we have held.

THE RIGHT APPROACH

I HAVE been thinking of what would be the best way of dealing with this Motion, because there are so many aspects of it and the House, no doubt, is interested in all of them.

Right from the first day that the Agreement came to be signed, many of our friends have been speculating about its success or failure. What exactly does this talk of success or failure of the Agreement mean? This Agreement was meant to deal with a particular situation and a very serious one that had arisen, especially in East Bengal, West Bengal, Assam and Tripura. It had affected the whole of India and also the relationship of India with Pakistan. The Prime Minister of Pakistan and I met to deal with that particular situation which, of course, was the outcome of many other things that had happened previously. No one thought—certainly I did not think—that this Agreement was going to solve the entire Indo-Pakistan problem. Apart from everything else, the House knows that there are a number of other matters of great importance that have not been settled. There is Kashmir, for instance; there is the problem of evacuee property which affects large numbers of people and the canal water question which has also assumed some importance. This Agreement obviously did not seek to solve all these major problems.

This Agreement, then, was intended to deal with a particular situation which had come to a head in East and West Bengal and the surrounding areas. It was meant to check the general drift towards a catastrophe. It was designed to bring a certain measure of relief to vast numbers of people both in East Bengal and West Bengal, the minorities in both countries who had undergone great suffering and were living in constant fear. They were, in fact, prevented even from migrating by force of circumstances—not by any statute or law. The immediate object was to put an end to the grave

Speech in Parliament on the Motion: "That the Bengal situation with reference to the Agreement between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan signed on April 8, 1950, be taken into consideration," New Delhi, August 7, 1950

tension and danger, to bring relief to millions of people and to produce an atmosphere which would take us towards the solution of many of the important problems that had arisen in Bengal. We had hoped that, when the atmosphere improved, we could gradually take measures to bring about some kind of solution. It must be pointed out, however, that the solution depends not only on agreements in regard to Bengal but on agreements covering the whole sphere of Indo-Pakistan relations. To talk, therefore, of the success or failure of this Agreement seems to me completely beside the point.

Speaking, I hope, with due moderation, I would say that few things to my knowledge have succeeded so much as this Agreement. Either those who talk of its failure are not in possession of the facts or there is something radically wrong with my thinking. One may say—and one could rightly say—that the position in West and East Bengal is not satisfactory. One may say that all kinds of difficulties exist there and that the minorities are not happy or secure. That is the problem and let us face it; but to say that the Agreement has failed does not mean anything to me. You may, perhaps, say that the Agreement has not solved the problem of Bengal completely. I never thought that it would, although I did think that it would help in bringing us nearer a solution to the problem. In my opinion, it has helped more than it was expected to. It is true that conditions in Bengal are not satisfactory; but it is also true that they are infinitely more satisfactory than they were.

The main thing to remember is that we have been suffering in India, not only in Bengal but also in other parts—and probably in Pakistan also—from a fever, from a sickness which did not begin with the Partition but which the Partition certainly aggravated. We thought, perhaps mistakenly, that we could get rid of that fever by the surgical operation which was Partition. So, here is this deep-seated illness, the disease we are dealing with, which comes out in all shapes and forms and will no doubt take a considerable time to heal. If we are unable to solve the problem quickly and immediately, it is not surprising. We are dealing with enormous social and

economic upheavals affecting the minds of millions of people.

We talk of migrations and there have been migrations on a tremendous scale since August 1947. But I should like the House to remember that the migrations did not begin in August 1947. They began earlier; in Bengal, a year before, with Noakhali and other places and in Punjab—especially from the Pindi and the Multan areas—in March 1947, that is, many months before Partition. There was that disease, that mounting fever at work which we tried to deal with in our own way. That is how the partition took place and we need not discuss at present whether it was right or wrong. Partition dealt with the disease to some extent but brought in other forms of eruption. We have been trying to face them and deal with them even since.

I talked of this background because people seem to think that the troubles that we are faced with are easy of treatment and, perhaps, can even be treated by strong language, whether it takes the form of a resolution or a speech. May I also remind the House that during this period—if we look at this question objectively—Pakistan has not been the only source of the trouble we have had to face? There has been plenty of trouble which originated in our own country. We will not be taking a balanced view of the situation unless we look at both sides of the picture. I say so with all deference, because when I read the various amendments of which notice has been given, it seems to me that not a single one of them has even tried to consider what has happened on this side. They have only looked at the sins and failings of others, not at our own. If we do that we would not only be acting wrongly but we would also fail to understand the situation. And if we do not understand the situation we must necessarily fail to deal with it. I find from the notices of the amendments that most of them want us to do something *vis-a-vis* the Pakistan Government. Most of them, in fact, want us to make Pakistan do something.

Now, that raises an interesting issue. Pakistan is a foreign country. One deals with a foreign country, roughly speaking, in two ways. One is the way of negotiations with such

pressure as can be exercised through them, whether the pressure is political, economic or diplomatic. The other is the way of war. There is no third way. These facts should be borne in mind. When hon. Members advise the Government to make Pakistan do this or that, what exactly do they mean? Would any hon. Member advise me to do this and that, let us say, in respect of the United States of America or the United Kingdom or Russia? We are dealing with a foreign country and we have to deal with it in accordance with normal international usage. I am not quite sure how far it is right and proper for a House like this to discuss a foreign country in terms of condemnation. It may be right for aught I know but normally speaking I believe it is not done.

Let us return to the actual facts of the case in so far as Bengal is concerned. There is no doubt that conditions in East Bengal and West Bengal are not normal. There is no doubt that there is a feeling of frustration and insecurity in the minds of the minorities. Now, I shall express my own opinion for what it is worth, because one cannot judge. I think that on the whole, the Muslim minority in West Bengal—which also, I think, suffers from a feeling of frustration and a certain insecurity—is relatively more secure than the Hindu minority in East Bengal. Nevertheless, I want you to remember that the Muslims in West Bengal are frustrated, too. I say this with certainty and I also say, with a certain measure of knowledge, that this applies to a large number of Muslims in other parts of India also. Let us not, in any way, preen ourselves and say that we have done our duty by the minorities which others have failed to do. I am prepared to apply one test to Pakistan and India and, as far as I am concerned, it is an adequate and sufficient test. The test is what the minority thinks of the majority and not what the majority thinks. So long as the minority in Pakistan does not feel secure and does not trust the majority, there is something wrong there. I am prepared to apply this test to India, too. So long as the minority in India does not feel secure and is not prepared to repose its confidence in the majority, there is something wrong here, too. We must consider both sides of the case objectively and fairly. If we do not do so, we put

ourselves in the wrong and take a lop-sided view of the situation.

There is so much talk of exodus. So many times it has been said that it is a one-sided exodus. I am amazed at the statement because nothing could be more untrue. It has not been a one-sided exodus, no, not for one day, not for one hour. How then can any one tell me that it is one-sided? True, there may be more on one side than on the other. True, on balance, the number on one side may be greater. But to go on repeating that it is a one-sided affair is absolutely wrong and contrary to the facts. Look at the figures. I have supplied you with the figures and I stand by them. It is no use telling me that the figures are wrong. My figures are collected as such figures are normally collected, that is, through the railway and the Provincial Government operators. I have no agents of my own; it is the West Bengal Government and the Railway Department that jointly and separately work to get these figures for us. It is difficult, of course, to collect figures for people who may have crossed the borders on foot. We can only guess. But for people who travel by air, by steamer or by rail we can be fairly certain and we are fairly certain about them. Indeed, if you take the proportion of the Hindu minority in East Bengal and that of the Muslim minority in West Bengal and then compare the figures of exodus from the two Bengals, you will, I think, find that, relative to their populations, the exodus was more or less the same in each case. There is not much difference. It is clear that, both in East and West Bengal, conditions became unfavourable for the minorities and, in fact, exerted a strong pressure upon them to leave their hearths and homes and migrate. One can come to this conclusion without much thought. This House knows that many Muslims migrated from Uttar Pradesh, too. Again, one can say that the conditions produced were such that they were compelled to migrate. It is no good saying that they were asked by a few persons to do so. The fact is that in these conditions they were afraid, they felt insecure and left. Again, with the reversal of these conditions, they felt more secure and now they are coming back. If, therefore, you want to deal with the problem of

migration, you cannot do so by simply saying: 'Here, we are spotlessly pure and our conduct is above board while there in Pakistan, people are sinful and are driving out the minorities.' If that is said, I say it is not true. An untruth will not succeed and will not prosper.

Now, coming back to the figures of migration, you will see that they are disturbing and they continue to create an increasingly difficult situation. Nevertheless, there is a great deal of improvement also. I cannot say if the rate of improvement is fast enough to catch up with the disturbing features of the situation. I am disturbed, I am distressed, I am not content with the things that are happening—that is natural; but if you examine the figures as well as certain other factors to which I shall refer, the situation is definitely improving.

Now, I have said and I say again that in my opinion the Hindu minority in East Bengal feels insecure and, therefore, cannot settle down. They want to come away. Even if they remain, they do not know how long they will remain; I also think that gradually the relationship between the people is returning to normal. I am quite sure that the conditions are much better in West Bengal now. They are not quite normal yet and during the last two or three months there have been two or three bad incidents in West Bengal. Nevertheless, the Government and the people there have gradually got over them. It is not, however, easy for me to judge how fast the feeling of security will grow in East Bengal. On the whole, conditions are still very insecure there. The insecurity comes not from major incidents but rather from a breakdown of law and order. There are dacoities—plenty of them—and often enough, these dacoities take place in the houses of members of the minority community and we have had far too many complaints of molestation of women in connection with these dacoities. It is very difficult to say definitely how many of these complaints can be proved, because we receive them naturally from the refugees and sometimes they reach us two or three weeks after the incident. Nevertheless, we are trying to lay down a procedure whereby every complaint will be investigated fully, whether it is a complaint from us in regard

to happenings in East Pakistan or from others in regard to incidents in West Bengal.

There has, however, been a very definite improvement in regard to two matters. One concerns the abduction of women and the other, the so-called forcible conversions. According to our reports, forcible conversions have practically stopped now. Our information in regard to the abduction of women is that, although such cases occurred some months ago, no fresh ones have been reported. The number reported previously was also relatively small and each case is being investigated. Relatively speaking, the number is not great, though, of course, that is no reason why we should not have effective machinery to deal with such cases.

One other factor must be remembered. It is admitted that the administrative apparatus of East Pakistan is poor. After Partition, most of the efficient officers came away to West Bengal or went elsewhere and left East Bengal with very junior and second-rate people to carry on the administration. Some, who were not in touch with the people of the Province and could not understand them, were imported from outside. That is another difficulty in dealing with the lawlessness there. I have no doubt at all that the Central Government in Pakistan has, to the best of its ability, tried to give effect to the Agreement of April 8 as we have done here. I think, the Provincial Government of East Pakistan also tried to do the same.

I have not, however, been quite clear about everything they have done. Some of their acts have seemed to me to be quite wrong. I am by no means certain, for instance, that the petty officials behaved correctly. According to the terms of the Agreement, we appointed two Central Ministers; our Government appointed a Minister and the Pakistan Government appointed one of theirs, and the two Ministers were specially charged with the responsibility for the implementation of the Agreement. We have had the experience of their work for about two months; they have toured about a great deal and made various recommendations. In the course of the last few days I have been seeing a great deal of them because both of them were here along with the Chairmen of

the Minorities Commissions and the Chief Secretaries of both West and East Bengal. I should like to say that both these gentlemen—our own Minister, Mr Biswas, and the Pakistan Minister, Dr Malik—have, in my opinion, done extraordinarily good work. I need not say much about our own colleague, Mr Biswas, because he is our colleague; but I should like to express my appreciation of the work done by Dr Malik. So, we find honest people are trying to grapple with and solve a difficult situation. They are up against the evil designs of some people and the inertia of others. They have to contend against economic collapse, against the total breakdown, we might say, of social life, especially in East Pakistan. It is, indeed, a highly complicated situation. Nobody, not even the bravest of us, can solve the problem all of a sudden. We are trying to do our best.

I should like to mention another thing which has troubled me considerably, namely, the question of requisitioning houses in East Pakistan. We attached importance to this matter right from the beginning and I told Mr Liaquat Ali Khan that things were not very satisfactory. Suddenly in July, that is, less than a month ago, we had a number of complaints about requisitioning and we were naturally surprised. We protested. To my amazement, we were told that the houses were being requisitioned by agreement with the Government of India. When we enquired further, we learnt that I was thought to be the culprit; a letter from me to the Pakistan Government was referred to as proof of this. The letter I wrote dealt exclusively with agricultural land. We were discussing the question of giving back agricultural lands to the returning migrants. The Chief Minister of the West Bengal Government had said that it was a little difficult for him suddenly to push out the people, refugees and others, who had been placed there to cultivate the land. Owing to the delicate food situation, the lands could not be allowed to remain fallow. He further said that he would get back the lands after the harvest had been reaped. We had agreed, however, to give every kind of accommodation to the returning migrants in the intervening period. There was some argument about this. I had written to the Pakistan Govern-

ment telling them what the Chief Minister of West Bengal had said to me. I had also agreed that these people be allowed to remain on the lands till they had gathered the harvest. If the Pakistan Government wanted to do this, obviously, we could not object. We were only talking about agricultural land but they apparently extended my meaning and applied it to urban properties, including houses. They started requisitioning on a large scale. I think 811 houses in East Bengal were requisitioned during the month of July alone.

I would like to draw your attention to another aspect of the East Bengal situation. We talk about forty lakhs of people having come away from East Bengal since the Partition. Half of them came before this year, long before this Agreement was concluded. Quite a number of them came almost immediately after the Partition, because they wanted to come away and that process, though slow, still continues. Mostly, it is the middle class elements that are leaving East Bengal on account of the pressure of circumstances. They have, in a sense, been squeezed out of East Bengal; they could not carry on their professions successfully, whether it was practice at the bar or the medical or any other profession. Many, however, stayed on. After all, you must remember that nearly a crore of Hindus are still in East Pakistan. It is a very large number. A very large number of middle class people have come away, especially people like teachers, after the February-March disturbances. As a result, schools were closed; educational institutions ceased to function; in short, the normal life of the minority community was completely upset. I do not know what the future holds. It may be that some new equilibrium will be established. Some people say that not a single Hindu can remain in East Bengal. I am not a prophet; I cannot say. Something may happen tomorrow to worsen the relations between India and Pakistan. That would widen the gap and make it more difficult for us. On the other hand, something may happen to bridge the gap. There are so many uncertain quantities that I cannot say what will happen. Normally speaking, I see no reason why a very large number of Hindus should not

remain in East Bengal and a very large number of Muslims in West Bengal. Since the Agreement on April 8, there has been a continuous flow back of the minorities, both Hindu and Muslim, who had migrated previously. Since I gave you the figures in the printed leaflet, there have naturally been many changes in the situation. Up to the third of this month, the figure for the Hindus who had gone back to Pakistan from West Bengal was 600,000. It is, undoubtedly, a considerable number. A number of them, no doubt, go there to fetch their goods and chattel. Our own estimate is that the figure is 15 per cent for those who come back. Out of the 600,000, we may say 100,000 have come back. Even so half a million people have stayed on. Again, if you examine the figures, you will find that the people who go back take with them their women and children. Normally speaking, people do not take women and children with them, if they are just going to remove their personal property.

The various amendments that have been proposed mostly refer to Pakistan. Whether it is a question of exchange of population in that region or elsewhere or some kind of territorial redistribution or whether it is simply, as some people say, an annulment of the Partition, I must confess that when I read such proposals or resolutions passed by responsible people, I begin to wonder whether they are sane. Something must be wrong somewhere; and, naturally, as I cannot examine my own mental apparatus, I suspect, that of the others has gone wrong. Now, if people talk of an annulment of the Partition in connection with the Bengal problem or the refugee problem, it raises a number of issues. One of them, of course, is that they are proposing something which involves a war on a prodigious scale. And even if we go through with such a war, what will happen after it is too terrible to contemplate. And, in any case, a hostile approach is of no help to the minorities. Now, with all deference, I would like each hon. Member to consider how is either an individual member of the minority community or the minority community as a whole going to be helped in this way. A way that involves conflict on a large scale means that

the first victims of that conflict will be the minorities themselves. It also involves general uprooting and upsetting without doing anything to produce the condition for rehabilitation we talk so much about. By the time the way of war bears fruit, the minorities or a good part of them may cease to exist. Every one of the proposals I have received involves an upheaval, a conflict and sometimes, though not always, war. Of course, you may say that everything that is in the national interest is worthwhile. You may be willing to pay a heavy price for it. I can understand that argument even though I do not agree with it. You cannot say that your proposals, if put into effect, will help the minorities because what you suggest will, in fact, only cause them the greatest possible distress and possibly much worse. It will uproot them completely.

Now, take the proposal regarding the exchange of population. I ventured to describe it some months ago as a completely impracticable and fantastic proposal. I would like to repeat that it is fantastic and impracticable and that this Government will have nothing to do with it. Furthermore, it is completely opposed to our political, economic, social and spiritual ideals. If you want to have an exchange of population, then you must change the whole basis of not only this Government but of all that we have stood for these thirty odd years and during the movement for freedom in this country. If people who have never had that basic background float about without any conviction or anchorage or faith, I can understand it. But we have a certain anchorage and if we lose that we shall lose ourselves, too. Therefore, let us be quite clear that these proposals are fantastic and impracticable not only because they involve war or something approaching war but also because in trying to work them out you will destroy the minorities, uproot millions of others and spend the rest of your life and that of the next generation in trying to rehabilitate them. Something even more important is involved in this. It is a question of faith and it involves our whole spiritual background which is even more important than the inconvenience and the distress which an action may cause us. Therefore, I would beg the

House to consider this question both from the idealistic and the practical point of view.

People say that this Agreement has failed, that it has, anyway, not accomplished anything. That is all very well but the Agreement is not a law unto itself. Sometimes, some of our own Secretaries to the Government carry on a tremendous amount of correspondence with East Bengal or West Bengal about the interpretation of this or that line in the Agreement, as if it were a final statute which has to be interpreted. I have no patience, I am sorry to say, with this kind of business and I have told them so. Leave aside the Agreement; let us consider the problem itself. What are you going to interpret there? After all, the importance of the Agreement is in its approach, not in this article or that paragraph. Where necessary, we can change the paragraph and make a fresh agreement. The whole point is in the approach of the Agreement and the approach of the Agreement, as the House knows, was such as thrilled the whole country; it made a difference to the world, it made a difference to millions and millions of people, Hindus and Muslims, in India and in Pakistan. The friendly approach made them feel that a great burden was going to be lifted from their shoulders, that we were going to settle our differences by friendly discussions and negotiations. If we perform our duty, others are likely to perform theirs and we will almost be in a position to enforce performance on their part. But if we do not do our job and fulfil our duty, then surely we have neither the right nor the strength to make others do their duty.

It is no good having an approach which is neither here nor there. I can understand—though I disapprove of it—the attitude of defiance and war. I can also understand the friendly approach but I do not understand a middle course which does not have the advantages of either. It is a weak man's approach. You get neither the benefits of a friendly approach nor those of the approach of defiance which takes no account of the consequences. Therefore, we have nothing to do with a middle approach. And, as far as I can see, there will be no warlike approach. Therefore, we inevitably have to

fall back upon the other approach, namely, that of negotiations. And having accepted this method of approach, let us not talk about it as something which we do not believe in, which we have no faith in and one which we think is bound to fail. Surely, we did not accept it out of the generosity of our hearts, knowing that we would give it up a few months later! If we disagree with anything, let us fight it by political or other means and put an end to it; but a kind of constant inner sabotage is not going to do any good.

Therefore, I submit that, so far as this Agreement is concerned, it has done a great deal of good. It has not solved the problem; nor was it expected to do so. The problem in all its aspects is still there for us to deal with but we must do so in the spirit of the Agreement and not pay too much attention to its details. *The only valid alternative is defiance and conflict.*

The position is a grave one. I do not wish to underestimate the gravity of the situation in the least but I do submit that every single proposal which I have seen—I mean the amendments—will add to the gravity and the mischief of the situation and will certainly not ease it. It is in the spirit of friendly negotiations that I would have this House approach this matter, remembering that it is indecorous to criticize a foreign government from this House. If we were to do so, they will criticize us in their Assemblies and, normally speaking, it is not a practice which an honourable House like this should encourage.

THE ATMOSPHERE OF SECURITY

FOR TWO whole days we have discussed this grave problem and many feeling speeches have been made. Various points of view have been expressed, often in forceful and passionate language. Whatever the other differences, we are all agreed

Reply to debate on the Bengal situation in Parliament, New Delhi, August 9, 1950.

on one thing, namely, that the matter under consideration is of grave import. I regret that the subject has not been dealt with in a constructive way. On the contrary, it has been treated from a political and destructive point of view. There may be a difference of opinion as to what the facts are but the difference can be at least partly settled by considering all the facts we have, carefully and objectively.

It is important to decide what our approach to this question will be, because that will govern our interpretation of the facts and our subsequent actions. This question covers many aspects, national and international, political and economic, social and communal and, above all, the human aspect. We have to deal with all of them; for the question before us affects millions of our countrymen and, naturally, anything that affects them has to be considered primarily in its human aspects.

What are the principles which should govern our approach? By what yardstick do we measure things? What are our ideals and objectives in regard to our country? Unless those objectives are clear, we are likely to flounder and lose ourselves in a morass of misleading detail.

Now, as I was listening to the speeches during the last two days, I felt that there was a great variety in the many approaches that were outlined. It seems to me that we—this House as well as this country—ought to be fairly clear as to what our objectives and aims are so that the steps we take might fit in with those ideals and objectives and into the picture of the India that we seek to build. Otherwise, we shall be continually in difficulty and I do submit that one of our major difficulties in the past has been this varied and often contradictory approach to such problems. You cannot have an approach that is friendly and hostile at the same time.

It is very likely that the Motion that I have tabled will, to put it colloquially, be 'talked out'; I should have liked—whether it is now or at a later stage is immaterial—this House to come to grips with the basic approach and principle that should govern our outlook and come to some clear decision. It is not fair to this House, to this Government or to the

unfortunate individual who happens to be the Prime Minister that we should waste our time and energy in meaningless conflicts and squabbles because our basic premise varies from individual to individual. Therefore, it would be desirable for this House and for the great organization that many of us represent to lay down clearly how the present problem should be approached.

Now, the Congress approach has remained uniform all this time and it is the bounden duty of this Government to follow that approach and none other. Broadly speaking, the Congress approach stands for equality, for the underdog and for the uplift of the people.

An hon. Member, Dr Syama Prasad Mookerjee, expressed himself in a language altogether different from ours and approached the problem in an entirely different way. Of course, he is not bound down by the Congress approach; nor have his past activities been conditioned by it. I may disagree—as I did—with Dr Mookerjee's approach to this problem; but I admit his right to follow his own approach and to express it fully. But I must confess that I was greatly surprised and somewhat distressed at the fact that many of our colleagues in this House, who are supposed to follow the basic Congress approach on which we have built up our policies and activities through the major part of our lives, treated it casually and tried, in fact, to reject it, to by-pass it, to ignore it, as if it did not exist at all or, perhaps, to think that in the present circumstances, it had no more force left in it. If there is no more force left in the approach of the Congress, we must examine the ideology which governed all our activities in the past and find out whether it still has any force. Surely, we are not without any ideology, without any ideals or objective, just living from day to day and reacting to individual circumstances! It is an important matter to consider, because we are face to face with grave issues in India and in the world. We may ignore the world but as the recent debate in this House showed, it is not a question of our ignoring the world or the world ignoring us. If there is a war in the world, it will inevitably affect our individual lives. Therefore, we must be careful as to how we look at the

problems which act and interact and affect one another.

Dr Mookerjee referred in an eloquent speech to a number of instances—I think he gave three specific instances—and then he threw at us a vast number of figures which he said his followers had gathered. He gave certain indications, too, of how he thought we might deal with the problem of Bengal.

It is difficult for me to deal with the figures that he gave, because I cannot check them. We also gather our impressions and our own figures through Government agencies and many private agencies. The West Bengal Government, naturally, helps us; so does our Deputy High Commissioner; we also get help from the Central Government's machinery and the Railways. In addition, fortunately, there are many brave men who are working for us under difficult circumstances in East Bengal and in West Bengal. So, we get all these facts and figures and impressions and, from these, try to form a composite picture.

That picture and those figures differ very greatly from those that Dr Mookerjee placed before the House. I am unable to accept them and I do not see how the House can accept them either. In any event, one would require some kind of proof and I do submit that Dr Mookerjee himself, if he examined them, would not accept them, because they have no *prima facie* evidence to support them. I am referring, for the moment, not to the instances of brutality but the individual cases that he referred to. He mentioned three of them and they were bad in the sense that they were painful cases. I have no doubt that these cases must be true; what I object to, however, is his talking about 600 to 1,000 incidents which have been gathered from people who have suffered and are excited, who often repeat things and whose cases have sometimes been found, on investigation, not to be based on any evidence whatsoever.

Srimati Renuka Ray and Srimati Sucheta Kripalani also spoke feelingly about the matter. It is right that all of us, especially our women Members, should feel the utter misery of what our brothers and sisters have gone through. But there are two points which I should like to place before the House. Srimati Renuka Ray was rather angry, if I may use the word;

with the expression that Sri Shankarrao Deo had used, viz., *kahani*, which she perhaps misunderstood. Sri Shankarrao Deo was referring to *kahani* not in the sense of a fable but in the sense of an incident, the story of an incident.

Anyhow, there is no doubt that such incidents have occurred and, as Dr Mookerjee gave three, I am sure many Members of this House can—certainly I can—add to that number. But the point is, are we going to consider this very grave matter merely in the context of certain deplorable and unhappy incidents and wallow in a sentimental morass and lose grip of the situation? We are a responsible House dealing with something that may affect the fate of the whole nation and may have even wider consequences. So, we must not be swept away, as at a public meeting, by a sentimental approach and appeal. That is why we have met in all seriousness to consider this matter.

Dr Mookerjee was good enough to invite me to visit Sealdah Station. I would gladly go there and I shall go there when I have a chance and when I think my visit will be of some use. I do not want to go there merely to make a gesture. That is not fair to those unhappy refugees nor is it fair to me. During the last three years we have had enough of tragedy and we have had our fill of horror. We have, with our own eyes, seen things which have left a permanent impression on our minds. I do not think any one who has gone through those experiences, whether in Bengal or the Punjab, whether in West Pakistan or East Pakistan or in this city of Delhi itself, will ever forget them. We seek a way of putting an end to this suffering. If we cannot do so, then surely our fate is going to be much worse. We shall suffer, not merely terrible misery but, worse still, inhuman degradation because brutality degrades everybody. It degrades the sufferer; it degrades also the person who makes others suffer.

Therefore, when these terrible things happened, for the first time in my public career, grave doubts assailed me and the future of my country, which was rising like a star, grew dim. It was not only because of what Pakistan had done. After all, my future is going to be governed by what my people do, not by what Pakistan does, just as their future will

be governed by what their people do. No doubt, what they do affects us. But, ultimately, my concern is with what my people do. Doubts came to my mind and it seemed to me that the noble edifice we were seeking to raise had been shaken to its foundations and that the strength and stability of the outline that we had planned for the structure had been undermined.

May I take the House into confidence about a certain matter which is, perhaps, known only to a few of my colleagues? It is a personal matter and, therefore, I apologize for the intrusion. When I heard that the disturbances in East Bengal had terrible repercussions in West Bengal and that all kinds of evil deeds were being perpetrated, particularly in Calcutta and Howrah, I was greatly upset. I was upset, as the House can well imagine, not only as an individual caring for my people and sympathizing with them in their miseries but as the Prime Minister, because I felt that in the ultimate analysis, the responsibility was mine. It was mine, not directly, perhaps, but in an indirect way, for the things that happened in East Pakistan; nevertheless, the responsibility was very directly mine for the things that had taken place in any part of India.

I knew that the military and police would do their job well or indifferently as the case might be. But there was something afoot which was deeper. It was not by soldiers and policemen that we can solve such problems. How could I, I wondered, affect the minds and hearts of the millions of people who are my own countrymen and also, if possible, those millions who are across the border? I did not see the way clearly as a Government or as the Prime Minister. The House will remember that I offered to the Prime Minister of Pakistan to undertake a brief tour of East Bengal and West Bengal with him. He, unfortunately, did not accept the offer.

The painful predicament of not being able to do anything from here in Delhi worried me. Ultimately, I came to the conclusion that, perhaps, I had exhausted my utility as Prime Minister and there might be other ways in which I could make myself more useful. Having arrived at that decision, I announced it at a full meeting of the Cabinet and told them

that I felt that my duty lay in East Bengal. If I was not allowed to go there in my official capacity, perhaps, I could go there unofficially, as a simple citizen of India and nobody would prevent me from going there. Perhaps, my going there—I could not attach too great a value to it—might be a gesture which would affect the minds of some people, would at least be a relief to me. I also told the Cabinet of my distress at the way the ideals of the Congress for which we had stood were fast fading away. I was left with nothing to fall back on.

It so happened that, very soon after, events took a new turn. Mr Liaquat Ali Khan came here at my invitation and for six or seven days we discussed matters and out of that discussion emerged the Agreement of April 8. Now, that Agreement put a new responsibility and a new burden on me. I was responsible for that Agreement, partly at least. That responsibility was later shared by the whole Government and this House. But, initially, it was my responsibility and I could not see my way to resigning from the Prime Ministership just at a time the new responsibility had fallen on me. So, I held on as I did. Whether it was right or not, I do not know; whether it is right for me now to hold on to this high office, I do not know. The moment I feel that I can serve the country better in some other capacity, I shall adopt a different course.

So, when we consider the problem of Bengal, let us for the moment put aside one or two things—not that they are not important, they are highly important—in order to consider it in a simpler fashion. First of all, let us put aside the incidents that have taken place. We admit them and we know that life is insecure in many places. We know all that. We have to find a remedy for them. The second thing is—and that is a very major question—the question of rehabilitation. In a sense, that should overshadow most other considerations. I wish that this House in the course of this debate had considered that matter more constructively than it did. Unfortunately, it was dealt with in a spirit of negation and destructive criticism. It did not, therefore, help me very much. It is a matter in which this House, I hope, will take a great interest and we would welcome every kind of interest,

every kind of help, because it is a question which the Government with all its faith and all the resources at its command cannot solve without a large measure of public co-operation and sympathy.

It is too big a question. None of our big questions can be solved by a government decree. Even if we had all the money for it, we could not have solved it without strong public support. And who can give that support more than the hon. Members of this House? I should like some of the hon. Members to go—some of them have already done so—to Bengal, especially to East Bengal. They should go and see things for themselves and help in creating the right atmosphere.

I gave this House a certain pamphlet containing some figures and other information and many hon. Members have cited it. An hon. Member has argued that since it does not contain information about rehabilitation in East Pakistan, East Pakistan must have done nothing about rehabilitation. I do not think this to be legitimate criticism, because the pamphlet was not, by any means, meant to be an exhaustive report on the subject. It was given under the Speaker's directions and it contained, in a consolidated form, the answers to some questions that had been asked by hon. Members. In fact, I gave the answers myself. So, it is not right to criticize it for its brevity. The figures we gave were obtained from the West Bengal Government. As for East Bengal, I know that something is being done to rehabilitate the refugees but I cannot tell you immediately what it is.

I shall put aside, for the moment, the question of rehabilitation, though I realize its importance. I shall also put aside for the moment the narrative of the evil deeds that have undoubtedly taken place. I shall consider instead how we must face the problem. Dr Mookerjee put forward three proposals. Those proposals, I take it, were in keeping with the recent resolutions passed by the Refugee Conference. Some Members of this House approved of one or more of those proposals and some did not approve of them at all. Anything that the Members of this House put forward is, obviously, worthy of full consideration. I have given every

possible thought to the proposals put forward by Dr Mookerjee. I have still not been able to get away from a feeling of great surprise that any responsible person should put forward any of the proposals, because, looked at from any point of view, whether from the point of view of an objective or an ideal or from the practical or the opportunist point of view, I say each one of them fails and fails completely. Analyse them. Let us not, in our feeling of anger at what has happened, take leave of logic and reason and of the practical aspect. I hope, of course, that we do not ignore the idealistic aspect because I always attach great importance to it but let us look at it primarily from a practical point of view.

I mentioned in my opening remarks day before yesterday that the entire object of the Agreement of April 8 was to create a certain atmosphere. We have spoken of the feeling of insecurity that prevails in East Bengal. There is that feeling of insecurity, although I believe—I hope it is not wishful thinking—that it is gradually lessening. Anything may happen to increase that feeling of insecurity or to decrease it. I am no prophet and I do not know what will happen. Some people believe that every single member of the minority community will leave East Bengal. Well, they have a right to their opinions. I will only submit that I find no reason for thinking so. Further, I would submit that if I had reasons for thinking so at present, I would try my utmost even then to prevent that from happening. I would not say anything or do anything which would encourage the Hindu minority to leave, because mass migration creates a terrible problem.

On the one hand, we point out the danger of the problem and, on the other, do things which aggravate it. This great contradiction has come in our way all the time. What, then is our approach to be? Are we going to approach it with a real desire to solve it—so far as such problems can be solved—by creating a feeling of security in the minds of the minorities everywhere? Or, shall we, while we complain of the lack of security, make the situation still worse by our speech and action? Hon. Members have said that people in East Bengal have not come away because of newspaper articles or of public speeches and that there are other causes.

Of course, there are other causes. Surely, a newspaper speech or an article cannot make a million people leave their hearths and homes; but when the mind of the people is disturbed as profoundly as it is today and the people are full of fear, then every little thing counts. We are, indeed, dealing not only with an economic or social upheaval but with a psychological problem of the first magnitude.

I think it is admitted all round that the psychological and the practical effect of the Agreement of April 8 was to reduce the fear of the minorities everywhere. There is no doubt that it did reduce their fear. Therefore, it can be said to have worked in the right direction. It is no use thinking about the results before we have created the right atmosphere. I must repeat that by removing from the people's minds the fear of an immediate disaster, the Agreement achieved a great thing.

Many things that you and I may do, this debate, for instance, will certainly have a reaction elsewhere; it may add to the insecurity or lessen it. India listens, in fact, the world listens to what the hon. Members say here in their speeches, even though this is not a public platform. Many people do not read the newspapers and the many things that are said here may not reach them; yet we know how millions of people are influenced by them, how a whisper spreads from town to town, from bazar to bazar. I can well imagine it said, 'Oh ! the Indian Parliament has decided this or that.'

If my good friend, Dr Mookerjee, says in his speeches that things are insecure, that things are becoming more and more insecure, then that itself is undoubtedly something which adds to the insecurity, that undoubtedly comes in the way of a gradual return to normality. Of course, Dr Mookerjee may try his best and I may also do my best but other factors may be stronger. We have no control over the Pakistan Government and are not free to do what we like. My point is, we should first control what we can control and only then can we try to control others with some assurance. There has been this contradiction all the time. Some people, some events, some factors have been working for the creation of a gradual feeling of normality and succeeding to some extent, while other factors have been working in a contrary direction,

thereby contributing to the feeling of insecurity.

May I mention another matter? The very first proposal which Dr Mookerjee put forward was a demand for the unification of India and Pakistan. It is phrased in courteous language. But what does it mean? It means, as every one knows, war. It means not only war which is bad enough but the creation of new problems before the old ones are solved. Wars do not solve problems; they only give rise to new ones.

Yesterday, my friend, Sri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, pointed out that in the Agreement arrived at between India and Pakistan, we had stated that we would not permit propaganda for unification or for war. On some occasions, Dr Syama Prasad Mookerjee himself was a party to these conferences. I should like to read to the House a particular clause in the Agreement of April 8. "The two Governments further agree that they shall not permit propaganda in either country directed against the territorial integrity of the other or purporting to incite war between them and shall take prompt and effective action against any individual or organization guilty of such propaganda."

Mark these words, and I say that I fail in my duty if I do not act up to them. I cannot, however, act up to them for various reasons: primarily, because we have a noble Constitution and laws which protect civil liberty in a variety of ways, even protecting uncivil liberty and licence. Therefore, I cannot give effect to my pledged word and it hurts me not to be able to do so.

Look at it in another way. What effect does this talk of unification, behind which lie force, compulsion and war, produce in regard to the security of the minorities? Can they have a feeling of security when they constantly hear of war coming? If the Pakistan Government tells us that we threaten it by the talk of war, what is to be our reply? We have none except to say that we and our Government dissociate ourselves completely from this wrong and harmful propaganda, that our country does not support propaganda and that we shall fight it to the utmost. That is all we can say.

Normally, it does not require an agreement between two countries to say that they will not seek territorial changes of

this type which, in fact, means a liquidation of those countries. No country can enter into such agreements. Pakistan has its separate entity and sovereign status as we have. We have an Ambassador at Karachi; they have an Ambassador here. We are represented in the United Nations and so are they. It follows, then, not only in international law but in accordance with every human and sensible approach to international problems, that no country can go on propagating the idea of putting an end to the Government or the system of another country. And yet, some of our people are irresponsible enough to indulge in such propaganda. Is it the way to solve the problem of the exodus? As I stand here, a gentleman, who is the President of the organization of which Dr Mookerjee was a respected member, is going about in East Punjab close to the border and in PEPSU advocating in his own particularly aggressive and pugnacious manner the annulment of the Partition and the unification of Pakistan and India by force.

The first proposal was for the liquidation of Pakistan and the third proposal was for territorial redistribution which involves major changes and which can only be brought about by war. Is it not an extraordinary proposition that individuals, who are presumably responsible, should go about telling people all this, thereby endangering international relations, embarrassing the relations between the two Governments and generally creating a feeling of insecurity in the country? Now, to come back to the specific problem which has been so much discussed, *i.e.*, the feeling of insecurity in the minority community of East Bengal, may I, in all humility, ask Dr Mookerjee or any one who thinks in the same way, 'Do you add to the security of the minority community by putting forward these proposals?' What will the reaction on Pakistan or on the minorities be? Realizing that there are groups in India which want war against it, which want to eliminate and liquidate it, the Pakistan Government must, naturally, react in a hostile way, in a way which cannot conduce to the security of the minority communities in the areas concerned. The proposals are, therefore, the worst possible approach to the problem of security.

I have not the shadow of a doubt in my mind that if all of us, including Dr Mookerjee, had set ourselves—forget the Pact for the moment—to create a feeling of security among the minorities in East Bengal and in West Bengal, though we would not, perhaps, have solved the problem completely, we would certainly have gone much farther towards a solution than we have now. And what is more, we would have solved it in the right way, in a way which adds to our strength and to the strength of the minorities. In the long run, the police or the military cannot protect people. They must have the strength to protect themselves.

I wonder if hon. Members remember the effect the non-co-operation and the civil disobedience movement had on the people. The object was to create strength in the people and it succeeded, because even the poorest peasant whose back had been broken by centuries of labour stood up, straightened his back and looked his landlord in the face.

Similarly, the object of the Agreement was to strengthen the morale of the people. Now, I submit that everything that weakens the morale of the minorities, wherever they are, is a basic and fundamental disservice to humanity because it reduces their value as citizens and as human beings. Therefore, I say that the acceptance of the two proposals I have mentioned is completely out of the question. They must be resisted by everyone who gives thought to their implications.

I shall now come to the proposal which touches upon the exchange of population. In the present context this can only mean a forcible exchange of population. As far as voluntary exchange is concerned, it is already taking place. The doors are open and people come and people go. In fact, it is taking place at such a pace that we can hardly cope with it. Indeed, it has created what is called the refugee problem. Now, on the one hand, we are unable to cope with this problem because of the pace at which the voluntary exchange is taking place; on the other, it is suggested that the pace should be increased, that the process be made speedier. They say it should be a planned exchange, as if the addition of the word 'planned' makes any difference. Plan, by all means. Nobody prevents people, for instance, from rehabilitating the

incoming refugees. But if we fail in this, what guarantee is there that we would succeed if ten times the present number of people should suddenly come? We are bound to fail. Planning depends on the planners, on the human material and on a hundred other factors. It is not confined to the question of money, though of course money is necessary.

Apart from the principles these proposals violate, these proposals are unacceptable even from the practical point of view. In fact, far from taking us towards a solution, they take us miles away from any solution. That is why I ventured to say on the first day that I wondered if I was lacking in sanity or whether some of the hon. Members were lacking in it.

An exchange of population must be a compulsory one. It must inevitably mean sending away people who do not want to go. It means, of course, as an hon. Member acknowledged, scrapping our Constitution. Scrap it if you want to but know what you are doing. We have bandied about the word 'secular', which I dislike. It means acknowledging our inability to cope with any national problem in a civilized manner. This brutal and barbarous approach would be unique in the annals of history and, of course, completely at variance with all that the Congress has stood for. You are certainly at liberty to put an end to the Congress itself but do so with your eyes open. Such proposals shame us in the eyes of the world. They show that we are narrow, petty-minded, parochial bigots who talk of democracy and secularism but who, in fact, are totally incapable of even thinking in terms of the world or of this great country. They put us in a position in which we have to say to people who are our own fellow-citizens, 'We must push you out, because you belong to a faith different from ours.' This is a proposition which, if it is followed, will mean the ruin of India and the annihilation of all that we stand for and have stood for. I repeat that we will resist such a proposition with all our strength, we will fight it in houses, in fields and in market places. It will be fought in the council chambers and the streets, for we shall not let India be slaughtered at the altar of bigotry.

Some hon. Members have talked of compensation for property and of planned exchange. Property is, no doubt, an

important thing in human life and we have been trying for the last two and a half years to settle the evacuee property question between West Pakistan and India somehow. We have not gone very far, although I believe I am right in saying that for the first time we see some glimmering of hope. My hon. colleague, Mr Gopalaswami Ayyangar, who has worked hard on this problem, also feels that some way out will be found. I can say no more about it. People talk about evacuee property in East Bengal and West Bengal and say 'Oh, about 5,000 crore of rupees would cover it.' Let us at least preserve a semblance of reason. At the present moment, Pakistan owes us our national debt and is going to pay it back in fifty years. It means nothing if you write Rs. 1,000 crore on a bit of paper. Where does the money come from? One can imagine some relatively reasonable figure being obtained or gradually realized but the talk of thousands of crores is absurd. People seem to think that they can sign cheques off for vast sums of money! After all, the wealth of a country is in its capacity for production and not in the jewels that the Maharajas wear. We should be most concerned with whether a proposal causes an increase or decrease in the productive capacity of the nation. Even if we get a large number of empty houses, hundreds and thousands of them, it will not help us much. The only possible solution to the rehabilitation problem lies in our pursuing the line of productivity.

Hon. Members will forgive me if I say that we cannot approach this problem with the mentality of a shopkeeper who just throws his money this way or that and sells his goods to make a profit. We must think of it from the point of view of production and think how we can make the displaced persons, our refugee brothers and sisters, productive members of the community. Let us, by all means, give them loans but ultimately they must become productive members of the community. That is the only thing which will make for real rehabilitation and also be good for the country. We must apply ourselves to the task of rehabilitation, not only because it is our duty to do so but because it is not in the interests of the nation to leave these people where they are, doing nothing and suffering.

I am sure that the Government of Pakistan will help us in promoting the atmosphere of security, not for love of you or me but because the facts and circumstances compel it to do so. I am quite convinced of that. That, of course, does not mean that it will cause us no trouble at all. It wants to solve the problems because it realizes, very sensibly, that any other course means ruin for Pakistan as much as it does for us.

NO-WAR DECLARATION

THE HOUSE will remember that I promised to lay on the Table of the House the correspondence that had passed between me and the Prime Minister of Pakistan in regard to various matters, notably the No-War Declaration. Subsequently, this correspondence grew and other matters also came within its scope. I am, therefore, laying on the Table a printed pamphlet containing the correspondence. I need not say much about it, because I am sure hon. Members would like to read it themselves; and then, if they wish to ask any questions, I shall be glad to enlighten them. I should add that, apart from the No-War Declaration, the correspondence contains the proposals we made about the setting up of a Tribunal to consider more especially two disputes, one in regard to the canal waters and the other about the evacuee property. Hon. Members have been asking me questions about them. This correspondence will enable them to understand what our proposals were and what the response of the Pakistan Government has been to these proposals. I regret to say that after nearly a year's correspondence, we have achieved no solid result.

Last night, I received another communication from Mr Liaquat Ali Khan in answer to my last letter which is published in this document. It has not been possible for me to include it in this pamphlet because it came too late. I am,

however, placing on the Table a cyclostyled copy of that also. I hope that this document will be available to hon. Members in the course of the day and that each one of them will have a copy.

Naturally, I have not yet found time to reply to Mr Liaquat Ali Khan's letter. We shall do so as soon as possible and a copy of our answer will also be furnished to Members. Meanwhile, I should like to make brief comments on some of the points arising out of the latest communication of the Prime Minister of Pakistan.

Perhaps, it is not easy for hon. Members to follow the comments on a letter which they have not read. As a matter of fact, most of the points raised in Mr Liaquat Ali Khan's communication have been repeatedly discussed in the course of the correspondence. Naturally, there is a great deal of repetition in our letters to each other. Most of these points have been dealt with in my previous correspondence and I shall answer them fully when I send a written reply to Mr Liaquat Ali Khan. For the present, I will just make a few brief comments. What I say now is not said in any spirit of controversy; the importance of good relations between India and Pakistan is too great for any of us to imperil them by words that excite passion. At the same time, we have to make our own position clear.

I may add that I had repeatedly drawn Mr Liaquat Ali Khan's attention to the kind of propaganda carried on by the press and statements made by individuals in Pakistan which were a direct incitement to war. I told him that this kind of thing, naturally, did not lead to good relations between the two countries. In his last letter, Mr Liaquat Ali Khan has referred to something about the Indian press. He has referred to the tone of the press throughout India and particularly in West Bengal towards the Delhi Agreement. I have previously had occasion to express my regret over the attitude of certain newspapers to the Agreement that Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan and I signed last April. It is not fair, however, to accuse the entire Indian press. On the whole, the leading newspapers of this country have dealt with the Agreement helpfully and in a spirit of responsibility and even the tone of some that were

once hostile improved considerably after a while. Now and then, there has been criticism of the Pakistan Government but that has been due to many causes, not a few of which are in the power of the Pakistan Government to remove.

As for the alleged activities of certain individuals, they are of no consequence and one should not take serious notice of them. May I add that this is a reference to one or two individuals who, I believe, proclaimed some time ago that they had set up a parallel government or something similar? I have no personal knowledge of the matter; but I have pointed out that it is of no consequence. In any case, what counts is the firm resolve of the Government of India to implement the Agreement in full.

Then, in his last letter, a reference has been made by Mr Liaquat Ali Khan to Junagadh. In Junagadh, it was the will of the people that prevailed, not any military effort by India. Mr Liaquat Ali Khan's reference to large-scale movements of Indian forces along the borders of Pakistan during the Bengal trouble is an indication that our action has been misunderstood. We had no desire then to attack Pakistan just as we have none to attack her now. Our measures were purely defensive and taken during a period of high tension; we should, indeed, have failed in our duty if we had not taken all precautions for the security of the country.

I am glad to note that in reply to my declaration made some months ago at a Press Conference to the effect that India would not resort to war in Kashmir unless attacked, Mr Liaquat Ali Khan has stated that Pakistan has no intention of attacking India either. As for his other arguments regarding Kashmir, I do not propose to answer them at length since our position has been made clear repeatedly. I would only say that while we sent our forces to Kashmir after the Government of the State had lawfully acceded to India, with the full approval of its most numerous and representative popular party, Pakistan sent its troops into what had become Indian territory, without any justification. As for the settlement of the Kashmir dispute, we have resiled from none of the assurances that we have given to the people of Jammu and Kashmir or to the United Nations.

I shall not go into the canal waters dispute here and only say that nothing we have said is inaccurate. There is some argument about what has been said. The statement attributed by the Prime Minister of Pakistan to our representatives was made by those who represented India on a sub-committee. Their report on the subject of canal waters was not accepted by the Punjab Partition Committee because of fundamental differences of opinion over the question of the distribution of the waters. I may also add that, in the early days, there were numerous committees and sub-committees dealing with Partition matters. There was the Punjab Partition Committee, consisting of representatives of the two Punjabs, which was quite distinct from the Central Partition Committee. The Punjab Partition Committee had appointed a sub-committee in the Punjab and in that sub-committee certain statements were made to which Mr Liaquat Ali Khan now draws our attention.

Mr Liaquat Ali Khan says he is convinced that a war between India and Pakistan will be an unmitigated disaster for both countries. He has given the assurance that he will continue to work for peace. I fully share this conviction and have affirmed it on many occasions. India's will to peace is certainly no less than that of Pakistan and I can give a categorical assurance that we shall continue to work for peace with our neighbouring country.

The discussions between Mr Liaquat Ali Khan and me before the Delhi Agreement brought out fully the value of personal contacts. I have full faith in them. Mr Liaquat Ali Khan has kindly invited me to pay another visit to Karachi as soon as my duties permit it. My duty here in Parliament and other preoccupations, however, make it unlikely that I will visit Karachi in the next few weeks. Nevertheless, I welcome Mr Liaquat Ali Khan's invitation and shall avail myself of it as soon as I am able to.

INDIA IS OPPOSED TO WAR

DURING these two days, many hon. Members have been good enough to express themselves in kind words about several aspects of our policy, especially our foreign policy. Much has been said to which I should like to reply; much has been said that has rather embarrassed me, especially so when it was meant to be kind but struck me as being just the opposite of it.

On this occasion, I propose to limit myself to foreign policy, particularly in the context of our relations with Pakistan and the question of Kashmir.

I am grateful for the support given to our foreign policy by this House. I am also grateful for what lay behind the kind words that have been said, because words as such do not carry much meaning. My colleagues and I have had to carry a very heavy burden and even though we may appear light-hearted sometimes, the burden is heavy. We naturally want as much support as possible, not merely kind words and phrases but intelligent support, understanding support, real support. I have, during the past few days, ventured to go out into the market place and to the fields to see large numbers of people in Delhi and the neighbourhood. I have tried to tell them about the questions that trouble us and about the great burdens we have to carry. I have asked them for their support. Wherever I have gone, I have found their support. It has heartened me because they are the people whom we presume to represent, whose ultimate will must count and whose morale counts more than any resolution.

I claim no virtue for myself or for our Government or even for our country and I suspect those who do claim it. It is easy to get into the habit of talking big about ourselves; but we know that the noblest words sometimes gain currency in the mouths of base men and lose their meaning. We talk about patriotism and love of country and very often so-called patriots indulge in unworthy actions. So, it does not very much matter what fine language I might use or other hon. Members might use in this or any other connection. The ultimate test is in action. It is in the fire of experience and trial.

Reply to debate on the President's Address in Parliament, New Delhi, August 11, 1951

We have been through grim tests and are the better for it. In spite of our weakness we had some principles to hold on to, some light to which we were drawn. We went towards it in our weak way and were strengthened thereby. We did not mind if instead of a garden we had sometimes to go through a wilderness. This is the way in which my generation in India has been nurtured. I say this, not in a personal context but because people in this country seem to have short memories and are apt to forget their past. They forget that we have not yet learnt to bow down to evil. We did not bow down to it when it was represented by a mighty force against us compared to which we were feeble and unarmed. How, then, can we bow down today when we are stronger? Are we really stronger in our minds, in our hearts and in the way we pull together? That is what gave us strength in the days of old. Does it give us strength today? I do not think our defence forces without the basic strength of a united people can go very far in times of trial. People have talked of being totally unable to eat wheat; they have said that they must have rice. It seemed to me that there is something basically wrong when petty questions are brought up at a time when big things are at stake.

We may have to live on wheat or something worse than wheat, if we are serious about freedom. It is no good talking of rice or complaining that we are not used to wheat. We will have to get used to many things that we are not used to. Many of us in this House who lived in jails were certainly not used to them! We were not born to live in the wilderness or in prisons. But we did not complain. If everybody wants the things to which he is accustomed, the demand must be met at the cost of someone else. One part of India may have to suffer at the hands of another part.

To come to the main issue, we have followed a foreign policy which this House has supported largely, if not always unanimously. I have often pointed out that our policy is not merely negative or neutral or passive; so far as I can see, it is a very active one. We do not wish to play a large part in the affairs of the world. We have troubles of our own. But, where our voice is sought, it will be given in accordance with our

views and nobody else's views, regardless of the pressure that is brought to bear upon us. Even if we have to suffer for that, I hope we shall be prepared to suffer rather than give up our independence of judgment and action.

Although every intelligent person must realize that a war must be avoided at all costs, no country can do away with the apparatus of war. At least, no responsible government dare take that step. If we value our freedom, we cannot afford to depend only on the good in human nature because we live in a harsh and cruel world. We have to depend on our own strength and be prepared to defend our freedom.

My friend, Dr Syama Prasad Mookerjee, appealed for statesmanship in his speech and I entirely agree with him. But it is very difficult to say what statesmanship really is. I do wish to say, however, that to think largely in military terms is not statesmanship. When I see that military objectives have become the goal of statesmanship, frankly, I am nervous and afraid. Our voice does not go very far in the international assemblies but, anyhow, it gives us the satisfaction that we have said what we feel is right.

This approach has governed our actions in foreign policy and we have tried to apply it even to our relations with Pakistan. Of course, very special considerations apply to our relations with Pakistan because of our past history and because of the conflicts we have had. Nevertheless, the fact remains that a major conflict between India and Pakistan would be a disaster of the first magnitude for both the countries. I say that and I shall repeat it because some hon. Members do not wholly appreciate that. If a problem is difficult it will not be solved through war. All war does is to kill a large number of human beings and destroy their property. It is a solution only in the sense that it can exterminate the entire population of a country. War, nevertheless, is possible for various reasons, one among them being foolishness. If a country is foolish enough to have a war you cannot run away from it; you have to face it with all your strength and put an end to it. Therefore, we envisage war, if at all, as a purely defensive measure. That is why we wanted to reduce our army.

Our approach is not, if I may say so, one of piety or pacifism. It is an approach based on hard facts and on a cold-blooded realization of facts. Since we want to avoid war, we offered Pakistan a no-war declaration which Pakistan did not wholly accept or agree to. And even a few days ago, this offer was repeated but they declined to accept it unless Kashmir was left out of it.

When we consider the question of Indo-Pakistan relations, let us look at it as a whole and not only at Kashmir, Bengal or Assam. Think for a while of past history, too, because what we see today has grown out of the past. Some twenty or thirty years ago, most of us stood, as we do today, for intercommunal unity. We wanted a peaceful solution of our internal problems and a joint effort to win our freedom. We hoped we could live together in that freedom. The supporters of Pakistan had a different gospel. They were not for unity but disunity, not for construction but for destruction, not for peace but for discord, if not war. I do not think that the people of Pakistan are any better or any worse than the people of India. I know that we have failed and failed quite often; and the person who talks most of his own virtues is often the least virtuous. Fortunately, a certain ideal was before us in this country during the last twenty or thirty years which naturally affected our thinking and action. And in spite of everything, that ideal continues to be our guiding star. That is the major difference between India's policies today and those of Pakistan. The latter are naturally derived from their previous record of discord, the deliberate propagation of hatred and disunity. I am quite convinced that a country that follows such a policy will injure itself. I fear the consequences of a narrow attitude such as Pakistan's and, therefore, do not want India to follow a similar policy, come what may.

An hon. Member talked of statesmanship and I must say I do not quite know how to define statesmanship. There are probably many definitions. If I may suggest one, 'statesmanship is the ability to think not only of your immediate urge, not only of the action before you but also of the consequences of that action, to think not only of today but of what

tomorrow and the day after might bring. In other words, perspective and vision are essential attributes of statesmanship. That test should be applied to some of the things that have been said here since yesterday. Proposals have been made in regard to East Bengal or Pakistan or Kashmir. It is futile, just because you are angry with Pakistan, to say, 'To hell with Pakistan. Let us go ahead ourselves.' That you have lost your patience with something that is happening, is no justification for you to do the same thing. You have to think of the morrow's consequences. I am, at the moment, not talking about moral standards. I am merely applying the pragmatic test of action.

The actions you indulge in must have consequences and these consequences flow from action as inevitably as any law of physics or chemistry.

My friend, the hon. Dr Mookerjee, seems to think that we have forgotten the minorities of East Bengal. Allow me to assure him that there have been very few things which have made us more anxious. It is true that, for a variety of reasons, we have not talked about it too often. And, in any case, talking would not do much good. Obviously, the problem of East Bengal, that of Kashmir and many others are all parts of a single big problem, namely, that of Indo-Pakistan relations which have deep roots in the past.

All you can do is to improve a situation like that in East Bengal but you can have no solution unless you solve the final problem first.

A year and a half ago, on April 8, we had an agreement with the Prime Minister of Pakistan in regard to the situation in Bengal and Assam. A good deal of criticism followed then and was repeated later. I am often asked by newspaper correspondents and other people what happened to the Agreement. Such questions surprise me, because I believe that the Agreement is among the greatest successes that we have achieved during the last few years. Of course, it did not solve the problem of East Bengal; it was never expected to. It was only meant to ease the immediate difficulty and improve the situation, to bring relief to millions of people and to make way for further improvement. The results it achieved were

remarkable in the sense that a great deal of human misery was relieved and millions were given help in a variety of ways.

Hon. Members ask me—though not always in so many words—why the Kashmir problem has not been solved. I can name a few dozen major problems of the world which drag on and on without any solution in spite of the United Nations and in spite of the best efforts of the people concerned.

I doubt if there are more than a handful of people in this wide world who want war. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the whole world is becoming more and more military-minded. Why is that so? Everybody knows that a world war would be terrible, that it would destroy the proud structure of European civilization and cause enormous and widespread misery. Yet, people go on preparing for war as though they were driven by some elemental and uncontrollable urge.

Two or three suggestions were repeated. One of the suggestions made to Pakistan on this occasion was that she should offer us territory in proportion to the number of migrants who come over. Another concerned an exchange of population and that, presumably, would also involve an exchange of territory. Let us be perfectly clear that such demands mean war. I hope nobody here is so foolish as to believe that such proposals can be effected merely by sending a registered communication. It means war and if it means war, let us not think of exchange of territory or population but of war. Let us not be confused. It is only too easy to make suggestions and later try to escape the consequences of what we say.

I have tried to put it to the House that by war we will not get what we want; we shall only win for ourselves a generation of terrible misery in addition to destroying everything that we have built up and being faced with the burden of terrible poverty. This will happen, irrespective of whether or not we win the war. Therefore, let us consider these problems a little more realistically and not jump to the conclusion that we can achieve our objective by some kind of strong action.

I would like to add something to what I have already said on the subject of Bengal and Assam. It is impossible for me to

conceive that the process of squeezing out large numbers of people can continue much longer. During the last year, an opposite tendency has been in evidence but, of late, the tide has turned again. There is no doubt in my mind that the general conditions in East Bengal are such that some kind of continuous pressure is exercised on the minority population. Presumably, they put up with the pressure and leave when it becomes too much. This is an abnormal situation which keeps alive the tension in Indo-Pakistan relations. It is something that will not allow us to settle down but I cannot find a magic remedy for it. It is one of those difficult problems which can only be settled when there is a basic improvement in the total situation. Of course, we can deal with it provisionally in the best way possible but the solutions thus effected cannot possibly be permanent. I have ruled out war as a measure for the easing of Indo-Pakistan relations but I cannot rule it out independently or unilaterally. Since the other party brings it in and talks and shouts so much about it, I have to be perfectly ready for it.

Now, I shall say a few words about Kashmir. May I say that the House had the great advantage of hearing today the authentic voice of Kashmir in this House? I am exceedingly glad that we had the exposition of Kashmir's position from one who is, perhaps, more entitled than almost any other person in Kashmir to give it, because the hon. Member who spoke is the General Secretary of the Kashmir National Conference.

In considering the question of Kashmir, we should also not confine ourselves to the present. We should go back at least four years when the trouble started; but to understand it, we should really go back eighteen or nineteen years when the movement against autocratic rule in Kashmir began. It gradually built itself up and challenged the Maharaja's rule. In the course of these years of struggle there were, naturally, many ups and downs; people were imprisoned and shot down; the things we faced during our fight for independence happened in Kashmir also. It is interesting to recall the part the leaders of Pakistan were playing in the days when the people of Kashmir were struggling for their freedom—not

only the people of Kashmir but the people in all the States in India. The House will remember that the Muslim League supported autocratic rule in every State; perhaps, they did not interfere openly but they certainly helped it privately. So also in Kashmir. I know that the Maharaja was a Hindu but the odd thing is that the Muslim League was in some ways in alliance with or being helped by the Hindu Maharaja's Government in Kashmir against the national movement. Not that there was much love lost between them but, because this great national movement for freedom had to be opposed, every odd group that could be rallied for the purpose was called upon to do so.

When all is said and done, there were no forces to challenge the national movement in Kashmir; there were small groups and scattered parties no doubt but nothing very effective. In the course of those years and till just before the invasion of Kashmir took place, efforts were made time and again by the leaders of the Muslim League to woo Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah in order to win him over to their side. The efforts did not succeed because the two viewpoints involved were diametrically opposed. You heard the hon. Member from Kashmir today and the attitude he represents is as different from communalism as anything could be. My friend, Mr Alva, talked a great deal about a secular State. I wish we were much more of a secular State than we are at present. I wish also that we would approach the ideal we have adopted in our Constitution. Too many people are attacking that ideal; too many people are trying to undermine it. If they do not actually attack it they act in a way which will undermine it. In other words, there are far too many people in this country who are communal and narrow. In Kashmir, it was a straight fight between communalism and the ideal that we hold and it is still the same fight. It is quite absurd to talk of India and Pakistan fighting for possession of Kashmir as if it was some booty to be seized by the stronger party. In Kashmir, people have struggled for a basic ideal. The Kashmiri people have also fought for that ideal more than our Armies did. Do you remember that before our Armies went there, there were three days when there was no proper

government or police in the Valley of Kashmir? I regret to say that those who were in authority then, ran away, taking with them their bag and baggage, while the enemy was raiding and pillaging, so to speak, almost at the Valley's doorstep.

What happened in the Valley of Kashmir then? Surely, if any sympathy for the invader had existed among the people, the whole Valley would have been offered on a silver platter to the invader. In the absence of a strong feeling of national unity and national consciousness, the whole place would have gone to pieces. Since the governmental apparatus had gone, there would have been terrible panic and confusion. Instead, the people of the Valley kept the peace for three whole days; the volunteers and the leaders of the National Conference, without arms, with nothing but their patriotic appeals, kept watch day and night and, to the last day, there was not a single shop that closed in Srinagar even though the enemy was only six miles away.

When people talk of plebiscite and accuse India of imposing itself on Kashmir, they should keep what I have said in mind. I have not the shadow of a doubt that, as Maulana Masoudi said, a plebiscite in Kashmir can only result in the victory of the present Government there.

You know the rest of the story about the invasion and what followed it. It is remarkable that, after all that has happened, some of our friends in foreign countries write and speak and behave in the manner they do. I can understand that their knowledge of events is limited; nevertheless, the assurance with which they try to lay down the law, sometimes the effrontery with which they advise us, amazes me.

When I think of Pakistan's case and the way they present it repeatedly, I am reminded of the story of a young man who murdered his father and mother. When he was tried for it, he pleaded for mercy on the ground that he was an orphan. It is really extraordinary how reality has been distorted beyond recognition by Pakistan. I have often wondered whether we have not made a mistake somewhere in regard to Kashmir. We may have committed many small errors but I just cannot

accept that any major step we have taken can be called wrong.

The House will remember that a year and a half ago there was a cease-fire and just about that time the UN Commission passed a resolution which we accepted. It related to the disbandment and disarmament of the so-called Azad Kashmir Forces and to certain northern areas. We, naturally, insisted that we would stick to the resolution since we had accepted it.

I shall not take the House into the details of the intermediate stages. Ultimately, the Commission left it at that since it could not reconcile our interpretation of these resolutions with that of Pakistan. Later, there were other developments; Sir Owen Dixon and others came into the picture. In the case of the last resolution passed by the Security Council, a strange sea-change seemed to have been evident. This resolution largely ignored what had been agreed to previously between us and the Commission. Naturally, we objected and pointed out that we could only be asked to do what we had agreed to do. The two or three major points we had raised and to which the Commission had agreed in writing are there for anybody to see. The fact is that they were ignored in the last resolution of the Security Council but the latter assured us that there would be arbitration about the existing discrepancies. We ventured to point out to the Security Council our unwillingness to give up the previous agreement. Since the fate of millions of people was involved, we were opposed to submitting the dispute to an arbitrator. That is why we voted against and rejected the resolution in the Security Council. I greatly regret that, when this resolution came up for discussion in the Security Council, two great countries, who are friends of ours, took an exceedingly unfriendly line. Their approach also seemed to me extremely illogical and based on ignorance and on considerations which were extraneous to the problem. Pakistan goes on saying that we have spurned the United Nations and the Security Council. I deny that. All that we have told the Security Council is that we stand by our previous agreements and it is they who have forgotten theirs. We are not prepared to accept anything

which either ignores the previous assurances given to us or challenges our self-respect or independence or honour. Pakistan is taking advantage of the fact that they agreed to the last resolution in the Security Council and we did not. Whatever was put forward later, happened to be to their advantage and they quickly agreed to it.

A great deal of fuss was made in the Security Council and elsewhere because the Constituent Assembly was called to meet in Kashmir. It was not anybody's business to interfere with the internal arrangements we had made in Kashmir. We went to the Security Council with a simple complaint concerning Pakistan's aggression. It is odd that we have not received any decision from the Security Council so far, although Sir Owen Dixon did say three years after it had happened that Pakistan's action was a breach of international law. The conflict in Kashmir is between progress on the one hand and reaction and bigotry on the other. I invite hon. Members to go to Kashmir and see for themselves the progress that has been made in spite of many difficulties. There has been progress in economy; in all kinds of public works, such as supplies and transport and, particularly, in the agrarian system. The entire face of Kashmir has changed. On the other side, in 'Azad' Kashmir, the conditions are, as Maulana Saeed said, strikingly different. The fact of the matter is that, from the psychological and the basic point of view, the battle of Kashmir has been won and the terrible shouting that is going on in Pakistan is the result of utter frustration and the knowledge that they have lost the battle. They have not lost it because of our Army or any army for that matter but because the contrast between the ideal for which the National Conference and Sheikh Abdullah fought twenty years ago and the things for which Pakistan stands today is so tremendous. We believe in the ideal of communal unity and not in the two-nation theory. The Kashmiri is convinced that the former is the right approach and that is why Kashmir has slipped out of Pakistan's grasp, thereby completely upsetting its rulers. In the 'Azad' Kashmir area, there are continuous squabbles and quarrels and it has the status of an occupied territory.

Some other matters between Pakistan and India still remain to be settled. There is the matter of evacuee property and canal waters. In regard to both we offered and still offer them judicial determination by properly constituted courts of Pakistan and India with provision made for the final decision.

In foreign countries, so much has been said in connection with Kashmir and its rivers that one would think that the rivers of Kashmir determine the destiny of Pakistan! It has been suggested that unless Pakistan controls Kashmir, the rivers will be diverted from their natural course and the whole of Punjab will go dry! I would beg the House not to mix up the so-called canal water question with the Kashmir question, because the canal water question does not deal with the rivers in Kashmir: it deals with the rivers in East and West Punjab, about the rights of which we are, as I said, prepared to have proper judicial determination. The rivers which concerned Kashmir, as hon. Members should know, are the Indus, the Jhelum and the Chenab. All that hon. Members need do is to look at the map of Kashmir. They will then realize that it is fantastic to mix up the Kashmir question with the canal water issue. In England and America much is made of this confusion.

I hope this crisis in our relations with Pakistan will pass. I am convinced that the only thing that will ultimately settle our various problems is friendliness. I am also convinced that friendship is bound to come, in spite of bitterness in the intervening period. If so, why should we not try to arrive at a friendly settlement soon rather than pass through all kinds of disasters and troubles? Regardless of the provocation Pakistan has given us and in spite of the daily talk of *jehad* and so on, we shall always be ready to solve every problem peacefully and to develop friendly relations with Pakistan. At the same time, we have to take every precaution against the war with which we are being continually threatened. I cannot detail to the House all the precautions we have taken in the military sense. Suffice it to say that for more than a month we have been giving the most careful thought to the matter.

A good deal has been said about civil defence. Prof.

Shah's idea of civil defence appears to me to mean some kind of conscription. It may be suggested on other grounds but it is not exactly civil defence. I think it would be a very good thing in this country—quite apart from the Pakistan issue—if there were conscription by which every man, rich or poor, was enlisted to do ordinary labour. So long as we do not compel people like ourselves to take a spade and dig, I do not think much good will be done to either our souls or the country. We think we are very wise and clever because we sit in offices with fountain pens in our hands. The idea that a clerical job is a better one than others will ultimately degrade the whole nation.

What exactly does civil defence mean? When people talk to me about it, I want them to talk intelligently and not just throw the word vaguely at me. Do you call what Pakistan is doing civil defence or do you mean something else? Pakistan is digging trenches, having black-outs and talking about fire brigades. I have definitely and, if I may say so, rather aggressively opposed the idea of civil defence and will continue to do so. I understand what I say and will not have our people wasting their time digging trenches and getting excited. By now, everybody has realized that morale counts a great deal. I am a better builder up of morale than most people know and I am determined to build up the morale of this country. Morale is not built by the stage tricks Pakistan seems to be practising. When I see attempts to duplicate in India the trickery staged there it does not affect me powerfully at all.

I was talking about Kashmir and the wonderful way in which the people of Kashmir have risen to the occasion. I deeply regret that a small section of the community, especially in Jammu, has played a game which can only be of advantage to Pakistan. It amazes me how the spirit of communal fanaticism makes people blind even to their own interests. The Constituent Assembly is going to be elected next month in Kashmir. The Hindus of Jammu are trying to put difficulties in the way of the Constituent Assembly as well as in the way of the National Conference and doing so in the most vulgar language. This is immature and childish. If I am

anxious about anything today, it is the communal spirit in India. Before I can deal with the communal spirit of Pakistan, I want to deal with the communal spirit in India, the communal spirit of the Hindus and Sikhs more than that of the Muslims. I want this House to realize that this spirit will stand in the way of our progress and weaken us. In the event of a war, we cannot fight the enemy if mischief is done behind our backs. No army can fight if its base is not strong. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that this wild and vague communal talk be put an end to at once. I am stressing this because people tend to express their great patriotism by cursing Pakistan and the Muslims. I want this House and this country to feel friendly to the people of Pakistan, because those poor people are not much to blame anyhow. What would you and I do in their place? If we had to read in the newspapers and hear on the radio stories full of falsehoods day in and day out, if we were enveloped in the atmosphere of fright and fury all the time, we might not behave very differently from them. It is not the fault of the people; but I do blame those who are responsible for all this. It is a heavy responsibility. It is not for me to say much about it. Anyhow, let us not create a feeling of ill-will for the common people there or for the country as a whole, because the feelings of hatred and violence weaken us.

In the last fortnight or so, many important Muslim organizations in the country have criticized Pakistan's action in the matter of Kashmir and some other matters and have offered their full support to our Government and to us. I do not always attach value to such things because people may do this to gain favour but, in this instance, what has been said to us represents the true feelings of the people concerned. That is greater proof of our strength than several armies. It means that our country is united in the face of danger. It means that we strike at the very root of the two-nation theory that Pakistan stands for. We should work for cohesion and make it clear to our minorities that it is our proud privilege to give the fullest protection and opportunity to them. I dislike the word 'protection' and the word 'minority', too. For the moment I use them so that I may be clearly under-

stood but I want these words to cease to be.

Therefore, it is unwise to think in terms of civil defence. We can dig trenches within twenty-four hours but, take it from me, that we will not require them. Trenches are dug for people who expect an invasion. Whatever happens, India is not going to be invaded. Even if there is war, do you imagine that we will wait idly to be invaded? Certainly not. That is why we are not going to dig trenches and have black-outs. In any case, I should like our people to put an end to the black-outs inside them and not to lose themselves in passion, fury, anger and hatred. I want them to take stock of the situation coolly—not complacently, mind you—and to be ready for every eventuality and to carry on their work normally.

INDIA AND THE WORLD

A VOYAGE OF DISCOVERY

I HAVE come to this country to learn something of your great achievements. I have come also to convey the greetings of my people and in the hope that my visit may help to create a greater understanding between our respective peoples and those strong and sometimes invisible links, stronger even than physical links, that bind countries together. The President referred the day before yesterday, in language of significance, to my visit as a voyage of discovery of America. The United States of America is not an unknown country even in far-off India and many of us have grown up in admiration of the ideals and objectives which have made this country great. Yet, though we may know the history and something of the culture of our respective countries, what is required is a true understanding and appreciation of each other even where we differ. Out of that understanding grows fruitful co-operation in the pursuit of common ideals. What the world today lacks most is, perhaps, understanding and appreciation of one another among nations and people. I have come here, therefore, on a voyage of discovery of the mind and heart of America and to place before you our own mind and heart. Thus, we may promote that understanding and co-operation which, I feel sure, both our countries earnestly desire. Already I have received a welcome here, the generous warmth of which has created a deep impression on my mind and, indeed, somewhat overwhelmed me.

During the last two days that I have been in Washington I have paid visits to the memorials of the great builders of this nation. I have done so not for the sake of mere formality but because they have long been enshrined in my heart and their example has inspired me as it has inspired innumerable

countrymen of mine. These memorials are the real temples to which each generation must pay tribute and, in doing so, must catch something of the fire that burned in the hearts of those who were the torchbearers of freedom, not only for this country but for the world; for those who are truly great have a message that cannot be confined within a particular country but is for all the world.

In India, there came a man in our own generation who inspired us to great endeavour, ever reminding us that thought and action should never be divorced from moral principle, that the true path of man is the path of truth and peace. Under his guidance, we laboured for the freedom of our country, with ill will to none and achieved that freedom. We called him reverently and affectionately the Father of our Nation. Yet he was too great for the circumscribed borders of any one country and the message he gave may well help us in considering the wider problems of the world.

The United States of America has struggled to freedom and unparalleled prosperity during the past century and a half and today it is a great and powerful nation. It has an amazing record of growth in material well-being and scientific and technological advance. It could not have accomplished this unless America had been anchored in the great principles laid down in the early days of her history, for material progress cannot go far or last long unless it has its foundations in moral principles and high ideals.

Those principles and ideals are enshrined in your Declaration of Independence, which lays down as a self-evident truth that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It may interest you to know that, in drafting the Constitution of the Republic of India, we have been greatly influenced by your own Constitution. The preamble of our Constitution states:

We, the people of India, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a Sovereign Democratic Republic and to secure to all its citizens :

Justice, social, economic and political;

Liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship;

Equality of status and of opportunity; and to promote among them all Fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity of the Nation;

In our Constituent Assembly do hereby adopt, enact and give to ourselves this Constitution.

You will recognize in these words that I have quoted an echo of the great voices of the founders of your Republic. You will see that though India may speak to you in a voice that you may not immediately recognize or that may perhaps appear somewhat alien to you, yet that voice somewhat strongly resembles what you have often heard before.

Yet, it is true that India's voice is somewhat different; it is not the voice of the old world of Europe but of the older world of Asia. It is the voice of an ancient civilization, distinctive, vital, which, at the same time, has renewed itself and learned much from you and the other countries of the West. It is, therefore, both old and new. It has its roots deep in the past but it also has the dynamic urge of today.

But however the voices of India and the United States may appear to differ, there is much in common between them. Like you, we have achieved our freedom through a revolution, though our methods were different from yours. Like you we shall be a republic based on the federal principle, which is an outstanding contribution of the founders of this great Republic. In a vast country like India, as in this great Republic of the United States, it becomes necessary to have a delicate balance between central control and State autonomy. We have placed in the forefront of our Constitution those fundamental human rights to which all men who love liberty, equality and progress aspire—the freedom of the individual, the equality of men and the rule of law. We enter, therefore, the community of free nations with the roots of democracy deeply embedded in our institutions as well as in the thoughts of our people.

We have achieved political freedom but our revolution is not yet complete and is still in progress, for political freedom without the assurance of the right to live and to pursue happi-

ness, which economic progress alone can bring, can never satisfy a people. Therefore, our immediate task is to raise the living standards of our people, to remove all that comes in the way of the economic growth of the nation. We have tackled the major problem of India, as it is today the major problem of Asia, the agrarian problem. Much that was feudal in our system of land tenure is being changed so that the fruits of cultivation should go to the tiller of the soil and that he may be secure in the possession of the land he cultivates. In a country of which agriculture is still the principal industry, this reform is essential not only for the well-being and contentment of the individual but also for the stability of society. One of the main causes of social instability in many parts of the world, more especially in Asia, is agrarian discontent due to the continuance of systems of land tenure which are completely out of place in the modern world. Another—and one which is also true of the greater part of Asia and Africa—is the low standard of living of the masses.

India is industrially more developed than many less fortunate countries and is reckoned as the seventh or eighth among the world's industrial nations. But this arithmetical distinction cannot conceal the poverty of the great majority of our people. To remove this poverty by greater production, more equitable distribution, better education and better health, is the paramount need and the most pressing task before us and we are determined to accomplish this task. We realize that self-help is the first condition of success for a nation, no less than for an individual. We are conscious that ours must be the primary effort and we shall seek succour from none to escape from any part of our own responsibility. But though our economic potential is great, its conversion into finished wealth will need much mechanical and technological aid. We shall, therefore, gladly welcome such aid and co-operation on terms that are of mutual benefit. We believe that this may well help in the solution of the larger problems that confront the world. But we do not seek any material advantage in exchange for any part of our hard-won freedom.

The objectives of our foreign policy are the preservation of world peace and enlargement of human freedom. Two tragic wars have demonstrated the futility of warfare. Victory without the will to peace achieves no lasting result and victor and vanquished alike suffer from deep and grievous wounds and a common fear of the future. May I venture to say that this is not an incorrect description of the world of today? It is not flattering either to man's reason or to our common humanity. Must this unhappy state persist and the power of science and wealth continue to be harnessed to the service of destruction? Every nation, great or small, has to answer this question and the greater a nation, the greater is its responsibility to find and to work for the right answer.

India may be new to world politics and her military strength insignificant in comparison with that of the giants of our epoch. But India is old in thought and experience and has travelled through trackless centuries in the adventure of life. Throughout her long history she has stood for peace and every prayer that an Indian raises, ends with an invocation to peace. It was out of this ancient and yet young India that Mahatma Gandhi arose and he taught us a technique of action that was peaceful; yet it was effective and yielded results that led us not only to freedom but to friendship with those with whom we were, till yesterday, in conflict. How far can that principle be applied to wider spheres of action? I do not know, for circumstances differ and the means to prevent evil have to be shaped and set to the nature of the evil. Yet I have no doubt that the basic approach which lay behind that technique of action was the right approach in human affairs and the only approach that ultimately solves a problem satisfactorily. We have to achieve freedom and to defend it. We have to meet aggression and to resist it and the force employed must be adequate to the purpose. But even when preparing to resist aggression, the ultimate objective, the objective of peace and reconciliation, must never be lost sight of and heart and mind must be attuned to this supreme aim and not swayed or clouded by hatred or fear.

This is the basis and the goal of our foreign policy. We are neither blind to reality nor do we propose to acquiesce in any challenge to man's freedom from whatever quarter it may come. Where freedom is menaced or justice threatened or where aggression takes place, we cannot be and shall not be neutral. What we plead for and endeavour to practise in our own imperfect way is a binding faith in peace and an unflinching endeavour of thought and action to ensure it. The great democracy of the United States of America will, I feel sure, understand and appreciate our approach to life's problems because it could not have any other aim or a different ideal. Friendship and co-operation between our two countries are, therefore, natural. I stand here to offer both in the pursuit of justice, liberty and peace.

FRIENDLY CO-OPERATION

I HAVE been in the United States for exactly eight days today. It is not a very long time. Yet I was surprised when I suddenly realized that it was only eight days ago that I had come, because during these eight days so much of significance has happened in my life. Experience and emotion have so piled up, one on top of the other, that I have the feeling that I have been here for a long time. Sometimes, when there are no new experiences, time seems to stop. I have had this experience of time stopping for months and years in my life—a curious experience. And sometimes time seems to race on; rather, one feels as if it were racing on, although very little of it may have passed. So, during these eight days, much has happened to me which has not only powerfully affected me in the present but has left upon me its deep imprint, which I shall carry with me and remember for a very long time.

Address to the East and West Association, the Foreign Policy Association, the India League of America and the Institute of Pacific Relations, New York, October 19, 1949

During these days, I have repeatedly had occasion to speak in public and my programme has often been a very full one. I knew that I was to come to this great banquet tonight. And I knew also that I had to speak here but I must apologize to you because I was expected, I am told, to prepare a written address, which I have not done. I have not done it, partly because I dislike very much this process of writing down speeches in advance, partly because I was not used to doing it in India and partly because, if I may confess it with all humility, I just forgot about it.

But in the main, may I say that the real reason at the back of my mind, the sub-conscious reason, was a growing feeling of confidence, of being among my friends here in this country. I began to feel more and more at home and so I thought I could perhaps take the liberty of having a friendly talk with you rather than deliver a formal address.

If I may indulge in a bit of personal history, I might inform you that I began what is called public speaking at a fairly late stage in my life. I was at college in Cambridge. I joined a well-known debating society. But I never had the courage to speak there, in spite of the fact that they actually had a system of fining the members who did not speak every term. I paid the fine willingly.

It was many years later, through the force of circumstances rather than anything else, that I started addressing public audiences. I began with the peasantry of my province. They didn't think and I didn't think that I was delivering a public speech at all. But I used to meet them and talk to them and those talks gradually attracted more and more people. Yet they remained just personal talks. I didn't feel shy with them because they were very simple folk. And so, very slowly I got over this inhibition, this difficulty of speaking in public. But I retained that manner of speaking, that is to say, of speaking to friends as if we were having a quiet talk together, even when the audiences grew and became colossal in number. So, if I speak to you in a somewhat rambling fashion, you will forgive me. I need hardly say how overwhelmed I am by the magnificence of this occasion and by the very distinguished

gathering that is present here. In spite of all that has been said about me by previous speakers, I am not a very aggressive person in public gatherings and I feel at times a little afraid of them. I am very grateful to the four host organizations for organizing this function. And may I say in this connection that I am grateful not only for this occasion but even more so to all the Americans who, in the course of the past many years, sent us their goodwill; and not only sent their goodwill but gave us their active support in the struggle for our freedom. I need not say anything to my own fellow countrymen here, because it was expected of them to give of their best. But it was very heartening to us in those days of struggle and conflict and ups and downs to hear the voices of goodwill and friendship and sympathy from America. I remember that on the last occasion, the beginning of my last term of imprisonment, a number of very distinguished citizens in America issued a manifesto—I think it was addressed to the President of the United States—appealing to him to take some action in regard to India. May I also say that all of us in India know very well, although it might not be so known in public, what great interest President Roosevelt had in our country's freedom and how he exercised his great influence to that end.

I have come to America for many reasons, personal and public. I have come after a long time of waiting because I have always wanted to come here ever since I was a student in England. But events took a different course soon after I went back to India and my travels and journeys were very limited. In the last two or three years, other limiting factors have come in and I could not come here earlier.

Originally, perhaps, it was curiosity that impelled me to come here. But in later years, more and more the thought came to me that it was necessary, it was desirable and perhaps, inevitable that India and the United States should know each other more and co-operate with each other more. In a sense that co-operation in the past could hardly be called co-operation, because a subject country does not co-operate with a great and powerful nation. But since we have become independent, that idea took more definite

shape. Though even now we may be a big country and we may have great potential resources, as we do have, nevertheless, we are new to these fields of international activity and in the terms that the world measures nations today, we are weak. We have no atom bomb at our disposal. We have no great forces at our command, military or other. Economically we are weak. And these are the standards—the yard measures—of a nation's importance today. We are strong in some ways—at least potentially so. Any person who can look ahead a little can say with a measure of confidence that India is bound to make good even in those material ways which count for so much in the world. All the factors are present there and the whole course of present-day history points to that. Anyhow, the time has come when we can look more towards the United States with some feeling of confidence which is necessary before we can really develop co-operative relations.

These relations cannot exist when one country is very weak and the other very strong. We are weak in some ways but there is one lesson we learned many years ago from our great leader, Mahatma Gandhi, in the days when we were still weaker. Our people, though they were unarmed, with no wealth or other outward symbol of strength at their command, faced a powerful and wealthy empire which had been in India for a large number of years.

It was a strange contest. I look back to that period just thirty years ago when Mahatma Gandhi, in a sense, burst upon the Indian scene. He was, of course, known before and loved and admired for his work in South Africa but he had not functioned on an all-India plane. He suddenly started functioning. And there was some magic about the message he gave. It was very simple. His analysis of the situation in India was essentially that we were suffering terribly from fear, especially the masses in India and even others. So he just went about telling us, 'Don't be afraid. Why are you afraid? What can happen to you?' Of course, when he talked in these terms he was thinking of the political fear that we had. If we did something that the British Government did not like, well, we'd be punished. We'd be sent to prison.

We might be shot. And so a general sense of fear pervaded the place. It would take hold of the poorest peasant, the lowliest of all our people, whose produce or nearly all of it went to his landlord and who hardly had enough food to eat. This poor man was kicked and cuffed by everybody—by his landlord, by his landlord's agent, by the police, by the moneylender. Everybody with whom he came into contact just pushed him about and he simply accepted it as something that fate had ordained for him. Whether there was something in the atmosphere or some magic in Gandhi's voice, I do not know. Anyhow, this very simple thing, 'Don't be afraid,' when he put it that way caught on and we realized, with a tremendous lifting of hearts, that there was nothing to fear. Even the poor peasant straightened his back a little and began to look people in the face and there was a ray of hope in his sunken eyes. In effect, a magical change had come over India.

There were many ups and downs. This teaching of his—'Do not be afraid'—kept us going and we found really that there was nothing to fear. Fear was something we had created. We went to prison in tens and hundreds of thousands. It was uncomfortable and many people endured a great deal of pain and suffering. But we found that it all depended on the way one looked at it. Obviously, if we had gone to prison for some high misdemeanour with disgrace attached to it, it would have been terribly painful. But because we felt we were serving a great cause, it became not a thing to be afraid of but something to be coveted. I put this to you, because, in the world today, we are again—compared with the great nations—weak. If there is an armed conflict, we are weak. As I said, we have no atom bomb. But if I may say so, we rejoice in not having the atom bomb.

So while innumerable difficulties have surrounded us and sometimes tried to overwhelm us, we have never lost heart. The one thing that has really been painful and has hurt us has been our own inner weakness. We have lost all fear of external aggression. Not that we are impractical or idealistic though it is good to be idealistic and we are that to some extent. After the last thirty years' experience, however, we

shall not be afraid of external aggression, unless, of course, we ourselves go to pieces. That would be our fault. What has pained us is our own inner weakness, because that has sometimes made us doubt ourselves.

I mention this, because elsewhere I have talked about this fear complex that governs the world today. It is a curious thing. It is like the fear of a man who possesses a great deal of property and is continually afraid of losing it or of somebody stealing it; he lives in a state of constant apprehension. Possibly, he might lead a more comfortable and happier life if he didn't have it and didn't have this continual apprehension. However that may be, there is this fear complex all over. I do not say there is no justification for it. There is justification for it in this world. We have seen terrible things happen and terrible things may happen again. Any person in a place of responsibility cannot become totally irresponsible about the future. He has to guard against it. He must take steps to prevent the terrible things from happening. That is true. Nevertheless, this approach of fear is, from every point of view, the worst of all approaches. It is bad for one's self; it is bad for others. Some of you may be acquainted with wild animals. I have had some little acquaintance—not very much—and have found and am convinced that no animal attacks man, except very rarely, unless the animal is afraid. Sometimes, the fear in the man transfers itself psychologically to the animal. The man becomes afraid of the animal and then the animal becomes afraid of him and, between them, they make a mess of it. I know numerous cases of individuals who go into the jungles without a gun or arms and are never attacked by any animal, because they are not afraid of any animal and the wild animals come and they look them in the face and the animals pass by. Well, it is perhaps not fair to compare wild animals with men. Nevertheless, the analogy, I think, holds. One party gets afraid. One nation gets afraid, then the other gets afraid and so the fear rises to a crescendo and leads to deplorable consequences. I do not know if it is possible to divert this emotion to other channels. While one must take all steps to prevent an evil happening, one must also shed fear and act

with a great deal of confidence, because that confidence itself brings confidence to the others who are afraid. And so we can gradually change the atmosphere in which we live.

India has been, for the last two years or more, an independent country. In another three months or so, we will formally inaugurate our Republic. That will be no addition to our freedom, except in the sense that it will be a confirmation of it and certain forms which exist now will go. Our purpose and our desire in the present is to be left in peace to work out our problems, not in isolation certainly, but in co-operation with others. We have got enormous problems. Every country has problems, of course. But the fact of 150 years of foreign rule, which resulted possibly in some good here and there, certainly resulted in stunting and arresting the growth of the people and of the country in many ways. Because it arrested the growth of the country, it arrested the solution of many problems that normally would have solved themselves—either by conflict or in peace; problems are solved and always a new equilibrium is established somehow or other. But because there was an overriding authority—that is, the British power in India—it prevented that natural equilibrium from being established in India from time to time and many things continued in India, which were completely out of date and out of place and which had no strength behind them, no roots in them. They were kept up, propped up, by an external authority. And so, problems accumulated—social, economic, political. As soon as the British left India, suddenly we had to face all those problems. We knew, of course, that we would have to face them. It was a big change. It was brought about co-operatively and peacefully and rather remarkably, for which credit is due to both the parties concerned, England and India. Nevertheless, however peacefully it was brought about, those arrested problems suddenly emerged. Not only did they emerge but all our people, who had been waiting for long years for political freedom, expected great things to come—great things in the sense of material betterment. Certainly, we wanted these

great things to come. Certainly, we had told them that freedom confined to the political sphere would not be enough. It has no meaning to give a vote to a starving man.

We had talked to the people in economic terms also and they expected a tremendous change suddenly, rather unreasonably, because these magic changes cannot take place suddenly. Just at this moment came other things—came the partition of India. It came without our liking it. We were apprehensive of the consequences; therefore, we had resisted it. Ultimately, we came to the conclusion that Partition was probably a lesser evil than the continuation of an inner conflict which was delaying our freedom. We were anxious to have that freedom as quickly as possible. So we agreed to the partition. That Partition, as it turned out to be in its consequences, was far worse than even what we had anticipated. It was the cutting up of a living structure, of everything—all our Services, whether the Army or civil Services, transport and railways, communications, telephones, telegraphs and the postal system, irrigation and canals. Many families, domestic households, were suddenly cut in two. An extraordinary situation arose overnight. It created tremendous new problems, among which were upheavals, deplorable happenings and killings and then vast migrations. All our energies, that ought to have been devoted to constructive effort, to economic betterment, which we had planned for years previously, suddenly had to be applied to tackle these new problems. We had no time or leisure or resources left to deal with the other and more basic problems. Nevertheless, the world didn't stop. India could not stop. And we did try to deal with the basic problems to some extent.

Our basic problem is the land problem, as it is all over Asia. And we have gone pretty far in changing the whole antiquated and unfair land system in India. We are putting an end to the great landed estates and giving the land to the peasant, compensating the previous owner. This process is going on now. Some months ago, in my own province in India, that is, the United Provinces, which is the biggest province and has the enormous population of about sixty

millions, we introduced a great reform in local self-government. In all the villages, a vast number of villages, every adult voted in what was probably one of the biggest elections that any country has had. We are going to have that all over India. That particular reform in local self-government, affecting all the villages, was really initiated some years ago when my sister, who is our Ambassador here, was the Minister for local self-government in that province. Now, this is an extraordinary and a most interesting experiment. Partly it is new. Partly it is going back to village self-government that existed before the British came. Anyhow, it is a tremendous experiment in democracy, important perhaps, because it is more basic than the Assembly that we may choose at the top. So, all these things have gone on. We are also proceeding with big river valley schemes which are basic for our development. All that has happened. But I want you to realize the background in which we have functioned. It has been made difficult by the after-effects of the war—and by all the other things that have happened. Still, I have little doubt that India is making good and going ahead.

There is a great deal of talk of Asia being a unit. Asia is in a sense a geographical unit, has been a unit in many other ways but in the main it was a unit in a negative sense. That is to say, practically all of Asia became the colonial domain of various European Powers. It was a unit in that sense; a Colonial domain where various different peoples were struggling for freedom against European imperialists; it was a unit because of their struggles and a certain commonness of purpose. But there is, at the same time, a great deal of diversity. It is not quite correct to think of Asia as a compact unit. There is not very much in common between the Chinese and those who live in Western Asia; they represent entirely different cultural, historical and other backgrounds. So also, you can separate other regions of Asia. There is the Far Eastern region, the Middle Eastern, the Arab, the Iranian and the rest. Now whichever region you may take, India inevitably comes into the picture. The Arab world may have nothing to do with the Chinese world or with

South-East Asia—something perhaps but not much. But India has a great deal to do with the Middle Eastern world, has a great deal to do with the Chinese world and a great deal to do with South-East Asia. India, geographically speaking, is a pivot; it is centrally situated from the strategic as well as every other point of view.

I have said that we have no desire to play a leading role in the international sphere except when we are compelled by circumstances. People talk about India's desire for leadership in Asia. We have no desire for leadership anywhere. Our greatest anxiety and yearning today is to build up India and to solve somehow the problems that face us; and then, in so far as we can, to serve the other good causes we have at heart in Asia and in the rest of the world and to co-operate with other countries in the United Nations and elsewhere. Whether we want to or not, we realize that we simply cannot exist in isolation. No country can. Certainly we cannot. Our geography, our history, the present events, all drag us into a wider picture.

I have been asked whether it had struck me that there might be a certain parallel between the United States in the early years and India. It has, in the sense that a big country grew up here. Certain relatively smaller countries were around it—to the south especially—and economically and otherwise they were influenced greatly by the presence of this dominating country in the north. So, I was asked how the presence of a big country like India affected the surrounding smaller countries and whether it had the same type of effect. The parallel is not exact. Nevertheless, there is much in it. Whether we want to or not, in India we have to play an important role. It is not to our liking, because we have enough burdens of our own and we do not wish to add to them. But, as I said, we just can't choose in the matter. India, in Southern, Western and South-Eastern Asia, has to play a distinctive and important role. If she is not capable of playing it properly, then she will just fade out.

I am quite convinced that there is no question of India fading out. Therefore, only the other role remains. Because of that and also because the United States is playing a vital role

in world affairs today—again hardly from choice but through the development of certain circumstances, through necessity almost—it seems natural for an Indian to think of closer relations with the American people and this great country. I think and I have been told that it is natural, in the present context, for many Americans to think of the importance of India in this respect. Therefore, the question of India and the United States understanding each other and developing closer relations is not only important from the point of view of these two countries but has a larger importance and significance.

Whether India has anything special to teach to the United States, I do not know. That is for you to judge. Certainly, I have not come to the United States to teach anybody anything. I have come here to improve my own education as far as possible, to learn something from America and to learn something about the world through American eyes, because both are important for me. I believe I still retain something of the spirit of a student and the curiosity of youth. It is not only this curiosity but rather a compelling necessity that makes me feel that I ought or rather that we in India ought to understand America better. Whether we agree with everything that the United States does or does not do is another matter.

This business of agreeing or not agreeing might be looked at in many ways. I think it is a wrong approach for any country or any people to expect complete agreement with another country or people about all things or to expect a duplication of their own ways and methods of thinking and action and life in the other country. The world naturally grows more uniform. Nevertheless, there is a great deal of variety in it, not only external variety in ways of life but a mental and emotional variety, too, because of different backgrounds and historical developments. If we seek to understand a people, we have to try to put ourselves, as far as we can, in that particular historical and cultural background. Normally, people do not make such an attempt at all. They feel rather irritated that the other person is so unlike them or does things in a different way. No attempt is

made to understand, except rarely. I have an idea that many of our present problems—international troubles—are due to the fact that the emotional and cultural backgrounds of people differ so much. It is not easy for a person from one country to enter into the background of another country. So, there is great irritation, because a fact that seems obvious to us is not immediately accepted by the other party or doesn't seem obvious to him at all. Even when we understand the other party's background we may not be able to convince him or he may not be able to convince us. But that extreme irritation will go when we think, not that the other person is either exceedingly stupid or exceedingly obstinate in not recognizing a patent fact as we see it but that he is just differently conditioned and simply can't get out of that condition. If you understand that, perhaps, your approach to him will be different from that blatant, direct approach which ends in this direct and blatant approach to you and which ultimately ends in the mutual use of strong language without the least understanding of each other's mind or function. One has to recognize that, whatever the future may hold, countries and people differ in their approach and their ways, in their approach to life and their way of living and thinking. In order to understand them we have to understand their ways of life and approach. If we wish to convince them, we have to use their language as far as we can, not language in the narrow sense of the word but the language of the mind. That is one necessity. Something that goes even much further than that is not the appeal to logic and reason but some kind of emotional awareness of the other people.

If I may refer again to my personal experience during the eight days of my stay here, I have met many Americans. I had met distinguished Americans during the past years in India and in Europe. I have studied a good deal of American history. I have read a good many famous American periodicals. So, I have a fair knowledge, as far as a foreigner can have, of the American background. Nevertheless, the last eight days here have brought to me, although sub-consciously—because I made my mind receptive to impressions and influences—some kind of an emotional awareness, apart

from an intellectual understanding, of the American people. People tell me—and it is very likely—that I can't know what the United States of America is after just three days in Washington and a week in New York. Nevertheless, even my present experience has brought that emotional awareness to me, which helps me much more in understanding the American people and the United States than all my previous reading and intellectual effort. Therefore, this kind of personal contact and receptivity of mind is helpful and, indeed, desirable.

You will not expect me to say that I admire everything that I find here in the United States. I don't. The United States has got a reputation abroad—Mrs. Roosevelt referred to it—of being materialistic and of being tough in matters of money. Well, I could not imagine that any country could achieve greatness even in the material field without some basic moral and spiritual background. Also, Americans are supposed to be very hardheaded businessmen. I have found a very great deal of generosity and an enormous amount of hospitality and friendliness. Now, all this creates that emotional atmosphere that helps in the development of friendly relations and in the understanding of individuals as well as nations. I shall go back from here much richer than I came, richer in experience, richer in the fund of memories that I take back and richer in the intellectual and emotional understanding and appreciation of the people of this great country.

Someone referred to the part that the women of India played in our struggle for freedom. There is no doubt that the part the women of India played was not only significant but of paramount importance in that struggle; it made all the difference in the world. I am quite convinced that in India today progress can be and should be measured by the progress of the women of India. In a political and outward sense they had fewer barriers to face than the women of some European countries and, perhaps, even here; I mean in regard to the vote and other things. They had to face certain social barriers which you have not had. Our political movement swept away many of those social barriers and brought

the women out. That shows that our political movement was something much more than a political movement, because it affected the lives of all classes of people. It touched those unfortunate people who had suffered so long, who are called the untouchables. They are not all untouchables; politically speaking, they are called untouchables. The movement affected them, affected the country's reaction to them. It affected women. It affected children. It affected the peasantry, the industrial workers and others. So, it was a vital movement which affected every class and every group in India. That is what a real movement should be. And in this movement the women of India, undoubtedly, played an exceedingly important part. Today, as perhaps you know, we have women in our Central cabinet and I believe in one or two provincial cabinets also. We had a woman governor in our biggest province. We have a woman among our ambassadors. In almost all fields of work our women take an active part.

ASIA IS RENASCENT

I AM happy to be in the capital of this great Dominion and to bring to you the greetings and good wishes of the Government and people of India. During the past twelve months, it has been my privilege to be associated in important discussions with your Prime Minister, Mr St. Laurent, and your Secretary of State, Mr Pearson. We have had to consider many difficult problems and I am revealing no secret when I say that our point of view and that of Canada were identical or very near to each other on almost every issue. In particular, I should like to refer to the spirit of understanding shown by your Government and your representative at the meeting of Dominion Prime Ministers, held in London last April, in the determination of our future relationship with the

Commonwealth. That spirit is in the great tradition of your leaders, Sir John MacDonald, Sir Wilfred Laurier and your last Prime Minister, Mr Mackenzie King, who is happily still with us. That tradition has been one of association with the Commonwealth in complete freedom, unfettered by any outside control. Canada has been a pioneer in the evolution of this relationship and, as such, one of the builders of the Commonwealth as an association of free and equal nations. India, as you know, will soon become a republic but will remain a member of the Commonwealth. Our past co-operation will not, therefore, cease or alter with the change in our status. On the contrary, it will have the greater strength because common endeavour derives from a sense that it is inspired and sustained by the free will of free peoples. I am convinced that this development in the history of the Commonwealth, without parallel elsewhere or at any other time, is a significant step towards peace and co-operation in the world.

Of even greater significance is the manner of its achievement. Only a few years ago, Indian nationalism was in conflict with British imperialism and that conflict brought in its train ill will, suspicion and bitterness, although because of the teaching of our great leader Mahatma Gandhi, there was far less ill will than in any other nationalist struggle against foreign domination. Who would have thought then that suspicion and bitterness would largely fade away so rapidly, giving place to friendly co-operation between free and equal nations? That is an achievement for which all those who are concerned with it can take legitimate credit. It is an outstanding example of the peaceful solution of difficult problems and a solution that is a real one because it does not create other problems. The rest of the world might well pay heed to this example.

Canada is a vast country and its extent is continental. It faces Europe across the Atlantic and Asia across the Pacific. Past history explains your preoccupation, thus far, with European affairs. Past history as well as geography explains the depth and intimacy of our interest in Asia. But in the world of today, neither you nor we can afford to be purely

national or even continental in our outlook; the world has become too small for that. If we do not all co-operate and live at peace with one another, we stumble on one another and clutch at one another's throats.

We talk of the East and the West, of the Orient and the Occident and yet these divisions have little reality. In fact, the so-called East is geographically the West for you. During the last two or three hundred years, some European nations developed an industrial civilization and thus became different in many ways from the East which was still primarily agricultural. The new strength that technical advance gave them added to their wealth and power and an era of colonialism and imperialism began during which the greater part of Asia came under the domination of some countries of Europe. In the long perspective of history this was a brief period and already we are seeing the end of it. The imperialism which was at its height during the last century and a half has largely faded away and only lingers in a few countries today. There can be little doubt that it will end in these remaining countries also and the sooner it ends the better for the peace and security of the world.

Asia, the mother of continents and the cradle of history's major civilizations, is renascent today. The dawn of its newly acquired freedom is turbulent because during these past two centuries its growth was arrested, frustration was widespread and new forces appeared. These forces were essentially nationalist, seeking political freedom; but behind them was the vital urge for bettering the economic condition of the masses of the people. Where nationalism was thwarted there was conflict, as there is conflict today where it is being thwarted, for example, in South-East Asia. To regard the present unsettled state of South-East Asia as a result or as part of an ideological conflict would be a dangerous error. The troubles and discontents of this part of the world and indeed of the greater part of Asia are the result of obstructed freedom and dire poverty. The remedy is to accelerate the advent of freedom and to remove them. If this is achieved, Asia will become a powerful factor for stability and peace. The philosophy of Asia has been and is the philosophy

of peace.

There is another facet to the Asian situation to which reference must be made. The so-called revolt of Asia is the legitimate striving of ancient and proud peoples against the arrogance of certain Western nations. Racial discrimination is still in evidence in some countries and there is still not enough realization of the importance of Asia in the councils of the world.

India's championship for freedom and racial equality in Asia as well as in Africa is a natural urge of the facts of geography and history. India desires no leadership or dominion or authority over any country. But we are compelled by circumstances to play our part in Asia and in the world, because we are convinced that unless these basic problems of Asia are solved, there can be no world peace. Canada, with her traditions of democracy, her sense of justice and her love for fair play, should be able to understand our purpose and our motives and to use her growing wealth and power to extend the horizons of freedom, to promote order and liberty and to remove want and thus to ensure lasting peace.

India is an old nation and yet today she has within her something of the spirit and dynamic quality of youth. Some of the vital impulses which gave strength to India in past ages inspire us still and, at the same time, we have learned much from the West in social and political values, in science and technology. We have still much to learn and much to do, especially in the application of science to problems of social well-being. We have gained political freedom and the urgent task before us today is to improve rapidly the economic conditions of our people and to fight relentlessly against poverty and social ills. We are determined to apply ourselves to these problems and to achieve success. We have the will and the natural resources and the human material to do so and our immediate task is to harness them for human betterment. For this purpose, it is essential for us to have a period of peaceful development and co-operation with other nations.

The peace of one country cannot be assured unless there is peace elsewhere also. In this narrow and contracting world,

war and peace and freedom are becoming indivisible. Therefore, it is not enough for one country to secure peace within its own borders but it is also necessary that it should endeavour, to its utmost capacity, to help in the maintenance of peace all over the world.

The world is full of tension and conflict today. Behind this tension lies an ever growing fear that is the parent of so many ills. There are also economic causes that can be remedied only by economic means. There can be no security or real peace if vast numbers of people in various parts of the world live in poverty and misery. Nor, indeed, can there be a balanced economy for the world as a whole if the undeveloped parts continue to upset that balance and to drag down even the more prosperous nations. Both for economic and political reasons, therefore, it has become essential to develop these undeveloped regions and to raise the standards of the people there. Technical advance and industrialization in these regions will not mean any injury to those countries which are already highly industrialized. International trade grows as more and more countries produce more goods and supply the wants of mankind. Our industrialization has a predominantly social aim to meet the pressing wants of the great majority of our own people.

This age we live in has been called the atomic age. Vast new sources of energy are being tapped but instead of thinking of them in terms of service and betterment of mankind, men's thoughts turn to destructive purposes. Destruction by these new and terrible weapons of war can only lead to unparalleled disaster for all concerned and yet people talk lightly of war and bend their energies to prepare for it. A very distinguished American said the other day that the use of the atom bomb might well be likened to setting a house on fire in order to rid it of some insects and termites.

Dangers, undoubtedly, threaten us and we must be on our guard against them and take all necessary precautions. But we must always remember that the way to serve or protect mankind is not to destroy the house in which it lives and all that it contains.

The problem of maintaining world peace and of divert-

ing our minds and energies to that end thus becomes one of paramount importance. All of us talk of peace and the desirability of it but do we all serve it faithfully and earnestly? Even in our struggle for freedom, our great leader showed us the path of peace. In the larger context of the world, we must inevitably follow that path to the best of our ability. I am convinced that Canada, like India, is earnestly desirous of maintaining peace and freedom. Both our respective countries believe in democracy and the democratic method and in individual and national freedom. In international affairs, therefore, our objectives are similar and we have found no difficulty thus far in co-operating for the achievement of these aims. I am here to assure the Government and people of Canada of our earnest desire to work for these ends in co-operation with them. The differences that have existed in our minds about the East and the West have little substance today and we are all partners in the same great undertaking. I have little doubt that in spite of the dangers that beset the world today, the forces of constructive and co-operative effort for human betterment will succeed and the spirit of man will triumph again.

I thank you again, Sir, and the hon. Members of this Parliament, who shoulder a great responsibility; for your friendly and cordial welcome and for your good wishes for my country. I realize that this welcome was extended to me not as an individual but as a representative and a symbol of my nation and I am sure that my people will appreciate and welcome the honour you have done them and will look forward to fruitful harmony of endeavour between our two countries for the accomplishment of common tasks.

Avant de conclure, Monsieur le Premier Ministre, je voudrais bien dire quelques mots dans la langue française. Je regrette que je n'ai pas la maîtrise de parler longuement dans cette belle langue. Mais je vous assure que nous l'aimons vivement, et je vous apporte, vous canadiens français, les salutations et les voeux chaleureux du peuple et du gouvernement de l'Inde, auxquels j'ajoute les miens.

OUR POLICY IS POSITIVE

PERHAPS it will suit the convenience of the House if I make some kind of a general statement about the work we are doing and the policy we are attempting to pursue in regard to our foreign affairs.

I shall not endeavour to go into the intricate details of what is happening all over the world, although, situated as we are and being an independent country of substance and importance, it is quite impossible for us to keep away from the many things that happen in the various parts of the world. Ever since India became independent, we have been interested in these various happenings all over the world. Indeed, we were interested in foreign affairs even before. But the first thing that we kept in view was to build our own country on solid foundations and not to get entangled in matters which did not directly affect us. Not that we are not interested in those matters but the burden of these entanglements would be too great and, as the House knows, the problems we had to face in our own country were big enough for any country to face.

Our general approach has been, as far as possible, one of non-interference in the various conflicts in other parts of the world. As the House may judge, we have followed this policy with greater or less success. Of course, as a Member of the United Nations, we have to participate in debates and express our opinion. In many subsidiary organs of the United Nations dealing with other matters, we had to express our opinion, particularly in relation to Asiatic countries with which India has a special relation. When the world is full of tensions and possible conflicts and people's passions are excited, it is a little difficult to look with equanimity at a country which tries not to be entangled in this way and which does not allow momentary passions to govern its actions. So, it happens that other countries regard with a certain amount of disapproval a policy which they consider either unwise or weak or a policy of inaction or of some kind of neutrality.

I have often ventured to point out, in this House, that the policy we were pursuing was not merely neutral or passive or negative but that it was a policy which flowed from our historical as well as our recent past, from our national movement and from the various ideals that we have proclaimed from time to time. If the House considers other different but, nevertheless, comparable countries and situations, it will realize that since India has to guard her newly won independence and solve many problems that have accumulated in the past, it becomes inevitable that she should follow a policy that will help as best as it can to maintain world peace and also avoid, as far as possible, entanglements in world conflicts. Whether that is possible or not is another question; how far our influence can make a difference to world forces is still another question. I do not pretend to say that India, as she is, can make a vital difference to world affairs. So long as we have not solved most of our own problems, our voice cannot carry the weight that it normally will and should. Nevertheless, every little thing counts in a crisis and we want our weight felt and our voice heard in quarters which are for the avoidance of world conflict.

We wanted to follow not a merely neutral or negative policy but a positive one, naturally helping those forces that we consider right and naturally disapproving of the things that we do not like, but fundamentally keeping away from other countries and other alignments of powers which normally lead to major conflicts. That does not mean that, in our economic life or in other spheres of life, we do not incline this way or that; it does, however, mean, in the jargon of the day, that we do not line up with this or that set of forces but try to maintain a certain friendliness and spirit of co-operation with both the great and the small countries of the world.

The House knows what we are up against today. For some years past we have talked about the atom bomb. But the atom bomb is supposed to have become a back number with the coming of the hydrogen bomb. I suppose, few people except the high experts know what the hydrogen bomb actually is. But, from what little information we can gather, it seems to be something

which may well destroy the world or a great part of it if it is used on a large scale.

Now we have come to the stage where some people seriously think in terms of large-scale destruction as a solution to all problems and conflicts. Logically, it seems an odd way of solving a problem. It is the way of ridding an individual of his disease by killing him or trying to cure a headache by cutting off the head of the person concerned. Nevertheless, it is significant and indicative of what the world is thinking today, that people should even think of the use of such weapons of utter destruction as the hydrogen bomb. So far as we are concerned, we can only express pious opinions about it, because we neither have nor are we likely to have the hydrogen bomb.

I shall not say anything about our world policy in a large sense except that nothing has happened in recent months to make us change the essentials of the policy we have been pursuing. Obviously, minor shifts or minor directions may be given to that policy but in its major aspects, major essentials or major directions I think the policy we have been pursuing is a correct policy and, indeed, it is the only policy that a country like India can pursue.

May I just refer to a period of history when a very great nation of the modern world, the United States of America, attained her freedom? It seems a long time ago and we perhaps imagine that the conflicts of today are more vital and more serious than the conflicts of a hundred and fifty years ago. In some ways that may be true. About a hundred and fifty years ago, the Western world was breaking up on account of all kinds of imperial and revolutionary wars. Having achieved independence by breaking off from the British Empire, the United States was naturally affected by these upheavals; nevertheless, it avoided being involved in the chaotic situation of Europe—although it doubtless had its particular sympathies—because that was the natural thing for a nation in that state of affairs to do. Now, this analogy, although it may not be a particularly good one in the circumstances of today, has a bearing and I wish to point out to this House that for a country that has newly attained

freedom and independence, this is the natural policy to pursue.

I referred to the United States of America, because, as the House knows, a few months ago I visited that great country. I had thus the honour and privilege of meeting not only the great ones and being accorded a most cordial and friendly welcome but also of receiving that welcome from the so-called common people of that land. It showed what an abundance of friendship and goodwill they had for our country. I value that very much and I was greatly impressed by it as also by the great achievements of the United States of America, from which we can learn so much. Naturally, I do not wish my country merely to copy another, because in whatever direction we may grow we must grow out of the roots from which our nation draws sustenance and follow the genius of our people. Nevertheless, I feel that we can learn a great deal from the U.S.A. as well as from other countries of the West and we should take every opportunity of doing so. If India is to grow and prosper, she cannot do so by sticking only to her roots and isolating herself from the rest of the world. Therefore, we must strike a balance between the two extremes and then only can we make good.

Whatever the field of activity—and this applies specially to the field of foreign policy—India must function according to the ways and methods of her own thinking, if she is to have any weight. India today is, fortunately, not small in extent, importance, potential resources or in her background of thought and action. When she fails or succeeds, she does so because of her own weakness or strength and not because of external factors.

The biggest fact of the modern world is the resurgence of Asia. It is a tremendous event: there is a great deal of good in it as well as a great deal we do not like, as always happens when major transformations take place. It affects us because we are in Asia; even more so because we are in a strategic part of Asia, set in the centre of the Indian Ocean, with intimate past and present connections with Western Asia, South-East Asia and Far Eastern Asia. Even if we could, we would not want to ignore this fact. Now that the greater

part of Asia is free from the colonialism of the past, our minds inevitably go back to the old days and old relationships with other countries in Western, Eastern and South-Eastern Asia. Our mind tries to skip this colonial period, to some extent, as we pick up the old threads again—the old threads that have to be picked up in a new way because new conditions have arisen.

The House knows how much active and friendly interest we took in the Indonesian Republic, which is now the United States of Indonesia. The House will also remember that we had the honour and privilege, a short while ago, of welcoming here the President of the United States of Indonesia, Dr Soekarno. He came here, not only as the head of that great new independent State but as a gallant fighter for freedom and a fighter who had achieved his objective in spite of very great difficulties. It was a pleasure to meet him here, to confer with him and to find how much in common we had in our national and individual outlooks. So, we become more and more intimately connected, not by formal treaties and alliances and pacts but by bonds which are much more secure, much more binding—the bonds of mutual understanding and interest and, if I may say so, even of mutual affection.

Then there is Burma which has seen a great deal of internal trouble during the last two or three years and has faced enormous difficulties. Naturally, our Government and our people are interested in the present and future of Burma. It is not our purpose—and it is not right for us—to interfere in any way with other countries but, wherever possible, we give such help as we can to our friends. We have ventured to do so in regard to Burma, too, without any element of interference.

Geographically, Nepal is almost a part of India, although she is an independent country. Recently, the Prime Minister of Nepal visited India. We welcomed and conferred with this distinguished personage and it was clear that, in so far as certain developments in Asia were concerned, the interests of Nepal and India were identical. For instance, to mention one point, it is not possible for the Indian Government to

tolerate an invasion of Nepal from anywhere, even though there is no military alliance between the two countries. Any possible invasion of Nepal, of which, incidentally, I have not the slightest apprehension, would inevitably involve the safety of India. I merely wish to point out to the House and to others what our policy in such matters is bound to be.

Freedom interests us in the abstract as well as in the guise of a practical and, in the context of Asia, a necessary step. If it does not come, forces that will ultimately disrupt freedom itself will be created and encouraged. We have accordingly advised the Government of Nepal, in all earnestness, to bring themselves into line with democratic forces that are stirring in the world today. Not to do so is not only wrong but also unwise from the point of view of what is happening in the world today.

Among our other neighbours, there is Afghanistan, for example, with whom we recently concluded a treaty of friendship. The history of our relationship shows conflicts as well as long periods of friendship and cultural contacts. It has been a great satisfaction to us that these old contacts have not only been renewed between independent India and Afghanistan but have actually progressed. And we are, therefore, on the friendliest terms with the latter. May I say in this connection that, because of the great tension between Pakistan and Afghanistan over various matters, we are continually being charged with having secret intrigues with Afghanistan and bringing pressure upon her to adopt a policy in regard to Pakistan which she might not otherwise have done? That, of course, I regret to say, is one of the numerous things without foundation which emanate from Pakistan. We are certainly friendly to Afghanistan. We are also interested in the future of many of the Frontier areas and the peoples who inhabit them. We are interested, whatever the political and international aspect may be, because we had close bonds with them in the past and no political change can put an end to our memories and to our old links.

I have always hesitated to refer to some of the things that were happening in the Frontier Province because it was not our policy to criticize the internal affairs of Pakistan. But

sometimes I have been compelled by circumstances to make a brief reference to the fate of our colleagues and friends who played a more important part than most of us in the struggle for freedom. It would be false and, indeed, inhuman of us to forget these friends who stood side by side with us for a whole generation in the fight for India's freedom. We are, therefore, intimately interested but it is a matter for abiding regret to us that we can only be interested from a distance without being able to help in any way.

Among the other countries of Asia, I should briefly like to mention Indo-China which has come to the fore recently because of her internal conflicts. The policy we have pursued in regard to Indo-China has been one of absolute non-interference. Our interference could at best be a theoretical one. I don't think that either a theoretical or any other kind of interference in the affairs of a country struggling for freedom can do any good, because the countries which have been under colonial domination invariably resent foreign interference. Their nationalism cannot tolerate it; and even if interference comes with the best possible motives, it is often regarded as a kind of weapon in the hands of those who are opposed to nationalism. Besides, interference exposes them to the possible slur that their nationalism is not a free, independent nationalism but that it is controlled by others. That is why we have sought deliberately not to interfere with Indo-China and we intend to continue this policy.

Then I come to that great country—China. Very great revolutionary changes have taken place in that country. Some people may approve of them and others may not. It is not a question of approving or disapproving; it is a question of recognizing a major event in history, of appreciating it and dealing with it. When it was quite clear, about three months ago, that the new Chinese Government, now in possession of practically the entire mainland of China, was a stable Government and that there was no force which was likely to supplant it, we offered recognition to this new Government, and suggested that we might exchange diplomatic missions. Since then, events have moved rather slowly. It may partly be due to the fact that certain important

members of that Government were away from their own country. In any event, the present position is that there is general agreement about such an exchange and a representative of ours, who used to be Secretary at our Embassy in Nanking, has proceeded to Peking to discuss certain matters of detail with the Peking Government. I hope that, before long, Ambassadors will be exchanged between the two countries.

As far as the rest of Asia is concerned, our relations are friendly and satisfactory with Iran as well as with other countries of the Middle East as it is called. Egypt, though not actually a part of it, is, nevertheless, associated with Asia and our relations are friendly with her also.

To turn to another part of the world, we have recently had many new diplomatic missions from South America established in this country. Although South America is very far away and we have little knowledge of it in India, I think, there is a great deal in common between India and South America. I have little doubt that in the future the nations of South America will play an important and ever-growing part in world affairs and I, therefore, welcome these contacts with them.

Then there is the great Continent of Africa which is still more or less a colonial continent. The House knows that we have recently sent a Minister to Ethiopia, one of the independent parts of Africa. Also, we have played some part in the United Nations in determining the future of North Africa and we hope that, in the course of a few years, independent nations will be built up there, too. When one talks about the African problem, one thinks mainly of the great mass of people, the Negroes, who live in the great continent. Mighty forces are moving in Africa and great changes are likely to take place therein the course of this generation. If these changes take place peacefully and by co-operation, well and good; if not, I fear that tremendous conflagrations will take place there. Any conflict between nations is bad enough; but when that conflict takes a racial character, it is infinitely worse. Naturally, we in India have sympathy with the Africans and have repeatedly, not only as

a government but before we became a government, assured them that we do not want any Indian vested interest to grow in Africa at the expense of the African people. I am glad to say that a realization of this fact is helping to bring about friendly relations between Indians and Africans, in East Africa especially and in some other parts also. Recently, a conference, at which a distinguished member of this House represented us, was held in South Africa. The object was to discuss the problems of those South African nationals who are of Indian descent. Although this was only preparatory to a full round table conference, it succeeded as far as it went. The problem is, of course, a difficult one; nevertheless, we have gone one step forward in grappling with it.

Coming nearer home, there is Ceylon, another independent country which has had the most intimate contacts with India for ages past and which is, in many ways, culturally very closely associated with us. I had an occasion to visit Ceylon some months ago and it was a great pleasure to me when I found that the friendliness of the Ceylonese people to us remained the same, even though we argue a great deal on the governmental level and cannot sometimes find agreement. I am sorry that the problem of Indians in Ceylon is still not wholly solved. I hope that some way out will be found, because in regard to Ceylon and India I refuse to think in terms of any kind of conflict.

May I now come to our relations with Pakistan, which have, ever since we became independent, completely overshadowed not only much of our domestic life but to some extent our foreign policy also? We agreed to the constitution of Pakistan by the partition of India because of a variety of things that had happened previously. We accepted it as a fact and we hoped that it would at least solve some of the problems that had troubled us. We did not accept it at any time on the basis of a two-nation theory but on the basis of some kind of territorial self-determination. Clearly, it was impossible to divide India on the basis of separate religious groups on one side or the other, because they were bound to overlap. It was also clearly understood that those communities which would become the minority communities on

either side must have the fullest protection and fullest security for their lives; otherwise the whole structure which we had built up would collapse.

Unfortunately, upheavals took place in North India and Pakistan immediately after the partition—and they were upheavals of such an inhuman nature and magnitude that none of us, in his wildest moment, could have imagined they were possible. I am not going into that. I shall only say that certain large scale migrations resulted. This imposed tremendous hardships on millions of people who had been uprooted and for whom it is so difficult to find roots again. All that happened; it came like a flood and we were overwhelmed by it. It is all very well for people to tell us, "Why didn't you think about this and prepare for it?" I do not know how any human being could have thought of it and prepared for it. Anyhow, it occurred, we made a great effort to stop it, to try to draw a line beyond which it should not go and to find some kind of an equilibrium again.

In those first days and months which were so full of tragedy, we had the great advantage of the presence of Mahatma Gandhi here and I do not know what would have happened without him. But he left us, almost—I might perhaps say—as a consequence of those happenings and the passions that they had unleashed. We had thus far dealt, you will remember, with West Punjab and the Frontier Province on the one side and East Punjab, a bit of Delhi and certain other areas on the other. In the Provinces of Sind, East Bengal and West Bengal, nothing had happened to begin with and we hoped that nothing much would happen.

But gradually we found that, in the Province of Sind, conditions were such as to make it difficult for the minority community to continue to live there. There was a ceaseless stream from Sind pouring into Northern India till at last Sind became almost bereft of any minority community except for certain scheduled classes, who remained there perforce, because they could not easily come away. This made us unhappy not only because of the fact that many people were upset and uprooted but rather because we began to see that the forces we had fought in the past and tried to neutralize

and overcome by all kinds of things, including the partition, were still at play. It suddenly dawned upon us that we had paid a very heavy price but what we had hoped to gain we had not gained: peace and equilibrium.

Meanwhile, the stream also continued from East Bengal, although there were no major incidents either in East or West Bengal. Sometimes it came almost in a flood and sometimes it reduced itself to a trickle. In the course of the last two years or so, about 16 lakhs of people, that is, a million and six hundred thousand, came over from East Bengal. Some people also went from West Bengal to East Bengal during that period. I have no figures but I think their number was considerably less. May I tell the House that, during the last year and a half or two years, a possibility that has always frightened us has been the development of an evil situation in East Bengal and West Bengal. It has frightened us because of the number and the great suffering involved. We discouraged in every possible way the migration of large numbers from one Bengal to the other. At one period, when it went down almost to a trickle, it seemed to us that we had probably stopped that migration. Unfortunately, in spite of our discouragement, people came over in hundreds of thousands. Then the events in the last two months or so have brought this problem, which had been a kind of bogey, right to the forefront. We have to face it and face it today.

I shall now go back to some other problems affecting Pakistan and ourselves. There is the Kashmir problem. You must have seen that a certain resolution on Kashmir was passed by the Security Council a few days ago and that we have accepted the basic part of it. Nevertheless, our representative, Sri B. N. Rau, had made it perfectly clear to the Security Council that certain implications of the MacNaughton formula were not acceptable to us. These implications have to do with the so-called Azad Kashmir forces and the northern areas. We have made it perfectly clear at every stage that we could not accept any other position than the one we have put forward. We have emphasized, in our reply to the Security Council, the basic moral and legal factors which we think govern the situation and to which—especially

to the moral factor—we attach great importance.

Quite apart from all this, ultimately the future of Kashmir must necessarily depend upon the wishes of the people of Kashmir. Our inducement to participate in the affairs of Kashmir did not come only from the invitation of the Maharaja's Government which was, of course, a formal and legal invitation by the constituted authority of the day. What impressed us much more and, indeed, what actually induced us to participate, was the invitation from representatives of the people there and we have remained there all this time only because of that.

There are other important matters between Pakistan and us, for instance, the question of canal waters, of evacuee property and of devaluation with which my honourable colleague, the Finance Minister, is so much concerned. These are questions which, when they arise between two Governments, should essentially be considered on expert level. As far as canal waters are concerned, we have repeatedly suggested a Technical Commission which would enable engineers on both sides to determine how best to use the waters that are there and how best to add to their utility. If ultimately there is some shortage of water—which our engineers think there will not be—then there are other sources that can be tapped. The way of approach is that neither country should starve the other but that both should make the best use of the available water. It is eminently a question which can be decided without passion to the advantage of both countries and the first thing about it is a technical examination by both.

If there are any matters which cannot be decided after a technical examination, we are perfectly prepared for an adjudication or a judicial decision. The Pakistan Government has been saying continually that we must agree here and now that this matter be referred to the International Court of Justice at the Hague. I have no objection to referring the subject to the Hague Court or to any court for that matter. But I do not personally think that the Hague Court is a suitable tribunal for this, because it will involve us in an enormous and lengthy process of litigation far away from us.

Anyway, whatever the means of arbitration, we need something that can produce results fairly rapidly and must not prolong the agony.

Evacuee property, too, is a matter for judicial and expert consideration. If necessary, I am also prepared to submit this problem to impartial arbitration or impartial judicial authority as the case may be. Here, too, we must devise means that will make a quick decision possible.

Before I go back to the new situation that has arisen in Bengal, may I remind the House that some time ago I made an offer to the Pakistan Government that we should both subscribe to a 'no war' declaration on behalf of our Governments? The draft that we proposed was published in the press and the House is no doubt aware of it. It was a very simple draft. The answer of the Pakistan Government was rather complicated; they said that before we did this, we must devise means for settling every other problem that we had, whether it was Kashmir or devaluation. I pointed out to them that it would be a very good thing if we could solve all our problems and that, if we were to solve them, the first step should be taken. What I wanted was to create an atmosphere which would help in the solution of those problems. So we went on arguing and the latest thing is a reply from the Prime Minister of Pakistan making various proposals about how the other problems should be tackled and what procedure should be laid down. Now, while this was happening, this eruption took place in East and West Bengal and I felt that there was a certain element of unreality in my talking about vague declarations, when we could not control the existing situation.

There were a great many difficulties in the way of people coming away from East Bengal to West Bengal but most of those difficulties have been removed; certificates of domicile and income-tax clearance were required; they are not necessary now. Also, the people had to pass through four barriers, losing some of their belongings at each. The Customs barrier was a legitimate one; again a police barrier; then the Ansar barrier and finally a barrier of common folk who called themselves 'Janagan,' which means people

gathered together! I visited a big camp at Ranaghat where people are arriving daily. I found that many of them have been able to bring a fair quantity of luggage with them, pots, pans, utensils, beddings and in some cases trunks. Obviously, there had been a relaxation in the matter of people bringing goods. What they were deprived of was, I think, mostly hard cash, which was taken away or which they gave as some kind of bribe to the various people who stopped them, so that they might bring their other goods with them. In all, since February 13, I should imagine, about 150,000 Hindus have come from East Bengal to Calcutta. About 100,000 Muslims have left Calcutta for East Bengal and this process is continuing daily. Their traffic is, therefore, not exactly one-way. It is a two-sided affair and entirely voluntary in the sense that people are not pushed out; they leave under the stress of circumstances.

As the House knows, there have recently been, in certain towns of U.P. and in Bombay, disturbances and incidents which I greatly deplore. A major disturbance also took place for two or three days in the Goalpara and Barpeta parts of Assam where there was an upheaval largely of the tribal folk, who swept down and committed a good deal of arson, driving away a fairly large number of Muslim inhabitants of those areas into either Pakistan or the nearby State of Cooch-Bihar. As far as I know, there was very little killing. I cannot say how many were driven away, because figures vary from 30,000 to double that number or more.

These problems obviously raise very important questions for us. Some people talk excitedly about war, some people talk vaguely about the exchange of population and we have to consider every possible aspect of the problem. Now, an exchange of population is something which we have opposed all along. It is something which I consider not only undesirable but also not feasible. It is a question of arithmetic, apart from anything else. If we wanted an exchange of population between East and West Bengal and if we did it with the complete co-operation of both the Governments on expert level and with every facility given, it is calculated that it would take five and a half years and that, if no untoward

event happened. Of course, many untoward events will happen in the meantime and, of course, there will be no such magnificent co-operation between the two Governments either! All kinds of upheavals will take place during that period, so that one cannot think of this solution in terms of reality.

Then again, where do we draw the line? The present position is that, so far as the Hindu population of East Bengal is concerned, one might say, generally speaking, that the entire population is full of fear and apprehension about the future and, given the opportunity, would like to come away from East Bengal. That is only their present feeling. I do not know, if they will actually come, when an opportunity is given. Perhaps, later some people will stick to their lands and other things. That will depend on the developing situation and on whether they have security or not. Quite apart from the larger considerations of the problem, our opinion is that people, especially those who are in danger, should for the present be allowed to come away anyhow and that the door should be kept open for them to travel from one part of Bengal to the other. The relieving of the tension will itself result in lessening panic and giving a little more sense of security to these people. The limitation is really that of transport, that more of it is not available. Anything between 5,000 and 8,000 people come over daily. Sometimes, there are 10,000 people a day. About 6,000 Muslims have been leaving Calcutta daily. On a particular day, there were 14,000 Hindus coming in and 10,000 Muslims going out. The number varies. They come chiefly by train; some come by steamer and about 500 people a day travel either way by air, too.

In this connection, it was suggested that a joint statement be made by Mr Liaquat Ali Khan and myself to meet the immediate situation of panic and danger, to prevent incidents from happening and to allow those who so desired to come away. We do not wish to encourage mass migration, partly because it would mean that people would suffer all kinds of hardships without being able to come away for a period at least. We also thought it important that full facilities be

given to the people to migrate under adequate protection. It is thus proposed that a kind of joint statement be made for that limited purpose, which, to begin with, would lay down that each Government be fully responsible for the security and protection of its minorities; secondly, that the guilty be punished; thirdly, that those who have suffered be helped, rehabilitated and compensated; fourthly, that an intensified search be made for looted property and that those persons found in possession of it and who have not voluntarily returned it be considered guilty of having looted it and punished accordingly. Also, that forced conversions be not recognized and that every attempt be made to recover women who have been abducted. Finally, there will also be a reference to the punishing of people who spread wild rumours and false stories which add to the tension. This applies to newspapers also. There is also a suggestion that there should be, on both sides, a Committee of Enquiry to go into all these things and that it should be presided over by a High Court Judge and include a representative of the minorities.

Obviously, this statement, if it were to be made, would have no great bearing on the major problem. The major problem would still remain.

An hon. Member referred to the *Dawn* and other newspapers. Well, it is not for me to speak of this but what Pakistan newspapers contain is something amazing; the way they publish libellous things is astonishing. However, may I in this connection add that, on the last occasion when I referred to this matter in the House, I congratulated the Indian press on its restraint? Unfortunately, I am not able to do so today, because it has not shown restraint during the last week or two. I make this reference in all solemnity and seriousness, because I have been watching the press and I have seen what passions have been aroused through it. It is understandable. I am prepared to admit that there has been provocation. I am not comparing the Pakistan press with the Indian press but the fact is that the press has carried headlines and banner headlines which have excited the people. I am not saying that the facts should not be published

but it is a question of how they are published. I may refer to one of the best newspapers in India, *The Hindu*. The same facts have been published in it and in some other papers but it is all a question of how it is done. May I also suggest to you that it is a fantastic proposition for a newspaper to go about having a Gallup poll on war? It is an incitement. We may have war or we may not have war but if newspapers take the formulation of high policy in their hands in this way, then we might be led into all manners of adventures.

Now, let me return to a very real problem. I was telling you that we were discussing the no-war declaration with Pakistan when all these things occurred and it seemed to me fantastic to talk about such a declaration when something that seemed worse than war was happening. It became rather farcical. We have, therefore to consider it in all its aspects. I shall put it to you quite frankly. Whatever policy we have to pursue in the future must necessarily depend largely on what happens in Pakistan and partly on what happens in India. Essentially, it cannot be formulated in theory, apart from the events that are happening. If there is a grave danger to the minorities in Pakistan, it is quite impossible for us to look on and remain calm. One does not know what might happen at any time. There have been no incidents but there is potential danger and one has to take all possible steps to prevent any untoward happening. Ultimately, protection in Pakistan can obviously be given by Pakistan alone. A country can give protection to its nationals only within its territory. It is quite clear that no position can be tolerated in the future where minorities do not have adequate protection and security. While we make this position clear to Pakistan, we have to make this clear to ourselves too. For, in a sense, the great responsibility has fallen on us.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, she agreed to a cultural and human approach as the basis of Partition but such an approach does not follow from the policy of a State which is Islamic in conception. Protection might follow but not equal treatment. In so far as we are concerned, our old practice, our background—in fact, our very theory of State—compels

us to follow a humanitarian policy. We shall be putting an end to everything we have stood for in the past if we slide in the slightest degree from that position. I myself am not prepared to move an iota from the position we have held in the past; therefore, the burden on us is all the greater.

A PROBLEM FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

THE PROPOSAL to limit the United Nations by the exclusion of some nations has surprised me greatly. Indeed, it seems to forget the very purpose and the very name of the United Nations. It is true that the high hopes with which the United Nations Organization was started have not been fulfilled. At the same time, there can be no doubt that the mere fact of its existence has saved us from many dangers and conflicts. Also, there is no doubt that in the world of today, it is the only hope of finding a way for peaceful co-operation among nations. If the United Nations ceases to be or if it radically changes its position and nature, then there is nothing left which would inspire hope for the future. We shall have to go through terrible experiences and face disasters again before we return to something which offers a forum for all nations, even though they differ from one another. The whole conception of One World, however distant that One World may be, involves an organization like the United Nations. To imagine that strict conformity to a single doctrine or approach can solve the problems of the world is to forget the lessons of history and to ignore the realities of today. However difficult the path, it has to be pursued by repeated attempts at co-operation on the part of all nations. Once that attempt is given up, the consequence can only be a preparation for conflict on a world-wide scale and, ultimately, the conflict itself.

Some people think that, in the circumstances of today, it is quite inevitable that the world should be divided up into

two hostile camps and that every country should line up on this side or that. Hostility, no doubt, exists but there are many countries who refuse to line up in this way. These countries believe that neither the pressure of world events nor their own destiny requires this lining up on either side and they, therefore, maintain their separate identity and view-point and thus serve the causes they have at heart.

If any attempt is made to change the essential nature of the United Nations, it will not lead to another or a more powerful organization which can work for peace. It would only mean the break-up of something that is actually and potentially valuable with nothing to take its place. I think, therefore, that the proposal to exclude any independent country from the United Nations is unwise and harmful.

FERMENT IN ASIA

MR CHAIRMAN, Your Excellencies and delegates, the Governor and the Chief Minister of the State of Uttar Pradesh have welcomed you to the city of Lucknow. May I on behalf of the Government of India, also offer you a cordial welcome and tell you how privileged we consider ourselves that you should have chosen this city and this country for this great gathering? For about twelve or more years now, I have been connected, first rather distantly and then more intimately, with the work of the Institute of Pacific Relations. I have profited by reading your publications and have always felt that you were doing good work in trying to understand the problems of the Pacific or the Far East. For a long time I have felt that, as time goes on, the problems of the Far East will become more complicated and the centre of gravity of the tension, prevalent in the world today, will shift to the Far East and in particular to Asia. While people readily agree that Asia has, to a certain extent, become the focal

point of world tension, they relegate Asian problems to positions of relative insignificance and tend exclusively to emphasize the importance of European and other world problems. I agree that European problems are and have been very important but I have felt that, in the perspective of things to come, they were wrong in not devoting the requisite attention to the problems of developing Asia. Asia compels attention in many ways. There are a large number of backward countries in need of urgent economic development and others in which acute scarcity of vital commodities prevails. But what is most needed is an understanding that Asia is going through a process of change and that it is in ferment. Some parts of Asia are quite and relatively peaceful whereas others are torn by external troubles and disturbances. I am not referring to the external situation so much as to characteristics inherent in the personality of Asia. I do not claim that this change is peculiar to Asia; perhaps, it is taking place all over the world. In Asia we have been kept down and are now trying to catch up with others who are ahead of us. We have been engrossed in things of the past and time has passed us by. We have not been able to keep pace with it and so we must run now. We cannot afford to walk but then when we run we also stumble and fall and try to get up again. We realize that speed, especially in an age-old continent like Asia, involves risks and dangers but we have no choice in the matter. If you seek to understand us, you can do so to a limited extent, if you discuss only our political, social and economic problems. You will have to look a little deeper and try to understand the torment in the spirit of Asia. This crisis of the spirit takes different forms in different countries. Ultimately, it is we who have to gain an insight into our problems with outside help if possible. Nobody can bear our burdens for us; we have to bear them ourselves. I hope that in your discussions you will give thought not only to our external problems but also to this crisis I have spoken of, which moves the minds of vast masses of people. If you asked me about my own country, it would be very difficult for me to answer briefly because I see so many forces at play. I am often asked: How has communism affected your country?

How do you deal with it? These are trivial questions and have perhaps a momentary importance. If you seek to understand a country by putting such trivial questions, then you are bound to get lost in its superficial aspects. One has to think of the problems which are fundamental to the life of a country, before one can presume to understand its people.

Asia is a huge continent and the peoples of Asia are all different from one another, as they were reared in different cultures and traditions. In spite of all this, I think it is still true to say that there is such a thing as Asian sentiment.

Perhaps, this sentiment is merely the outcome of the past two or three hundred years of European influence in Asia. Personally, I do not believe that any profound difference exists between the Orient and the Occident. Such differences as can be accounted for by history, tradition and geography exist even among the Asian countries and, in fact, even within the same country. Probably, the present-day differences mainly arose from the fact that certain parts of the world developed their resources and became prosperous while others were completely unaffected by the industrial revolution.

I think that thinking in terms of the Orient and the Occident sets us on the wrong track. As a rule, the same type of problems lead to the same results everywhere. At the same time, there are certain countries like India and China with pronounced national characteristics where history and tradition exert a profound influence on the course of events. I am sure there is a great deal of good in this tradition. We should have gone under but for that. We have survived on account of the good in our tradition and we propose to hold on to it. At the same time, I have no doubt at all that it has a great deal that is bad, too. It prevents us from doing the things we ought to do and so, between the good and the bad and between the past and the present, we do not quite know what we are going to do and what we should do.

If you ask me about India it would take me a long time to tell you about all the aspects of our problems. Our difficulties are not only external but also of the mind and spirit. There are certain tendencies that carry us forward and

others that retard our forward movement—I will not call it progress—and compel us to look behind.

Progress consists in having the essential things of life and in that sense we obviously must have progress. We are going ahead and I hope rapidly. We are harnessing science for the service of the nation. Yet a doubt arises in my mind as to whether material progress really constitutes a remedy for our problems. It is, at best, only a partial solution; something more is needed. We need a solution of the broad problems that afflict the world today. Many of these are probably evils that have resulted from an indiscriminate application of science which we have now begun to worship. What are we aiming at and where are we heading for? I feel that unless we answer these questions, we are apt to go astray. You know that many of us in this country have spent a great part of our lives in trying, though imperfectly, to follow the lead of our great leader. We were poor stuff. Again and again, he gave us the strength and the vision to achieve our goal. For thirty years or more, we took shelter under his shadow and under his guidance. He preached non-violence and strangely enough, we followed him, to some extent, though we did not quite understand him. We felt the greatness of his presence and his personality and we followed him in certain things to the best of our ability. He preached non-violence and yet we see round us a world full of violence. Our own Government maintains an army, a navy and an air force and we are often constrained to have recourse to violence. The efficacy of non-violence is not entirely convincing. What are we to do about it all? None of us would dare, in the present state of the world, to do away with the instruments of organised violence. We keep armies both to defend ourselves against aggression from without and to meet trouble within. While I grant that we must keep armies, it is also true that the armed forces have not solved the problems for which violence is offered as a solution.

Our Army, Navy and Air Force are not worth mentioning compared with the armadas of other nations. But have these countries solved their problems with the help of their

armed forces? I am of the opinion that they have not. We find that somehow the methods we adopt to deal with evil only result in more evil. What then are we to do? We have to meet the evil with armed force; yet in doing so we are ourselves corrupted by that evil. Eventually, we develop what may be called the military outlook.

While there have been great soldiers and great men in the past, I do not think that the military outlook or the purely military method has yet solved any major problem of the world. That was why a great Frenchman once said that war was much too serious a thing to be entrusted to soldiers. But if it is too serious to be entrusted to the soldier, to entrust it to a civilian with a military outlook is worse. If a nation or a government develops a military outlook, then there is little hope for that nation.

For the last three years or so we have been faced with a minor war in Korea which has in it the seeds of a mighty conflict. Almost every country wanted the war to be at least localized and ultimately brought to an end. Yet, the military mind wanted to go much further, believing that by going further it would solve other basic problems also. It failed to recognize the essential lesson of history, namely, that if you go too far you might topple over and create a fresh crop of problems.

It is my misfortune that I have to deal with these problems in my capacity as a member of the Government. I have to advise my Government and sometimes venture to express an opinion to other Governments. Often enough I find that we are, fortunately, not in agreement with them. I sometimes presume to think that perhaps we in India or in Asia may conceivably have a better understanding of the inner problems of mind and spirit that trouble Asia and which will ultimately determine her actions. Economics plays an important and vital part in the lives of men but there are other forces which play an even more important part and it may be that we in Asia, whatever the country to which we belong, are in a somewhat better position to understand our neighbours in Asia than those nations who have an entirely different cultural heritage. In a spirit of arrogance I once

ventured to say that many Western countries lacked subtlety of thought in understanding the East or in dealing with it; but how can one acquire that understanding?

Are problems of nationalism in Asia different from those in Europe? If so, how are they different and what exactly do we mean by nationalism? It is difficult to define the concept of nationalism. In a country struggling against foreign domination one knows exactly what nationalism means. It is merely an anti-foreign feeling. But what is nationalism in a free country? Under certain conditions it can be a constructive force. Sometimes, we find that nationalism, a healthy force in a country striving for its freedom, may become, after the country has been liberated, unhealthy and even reactionary. *It may seek to promote its interests at the expense of other countries and it may repeat the very errors against which it had to contend.* But where shall we draw the line between what is good and what is bad in nationalism? We have just won our freedom but the nationalist sentiments that inspired our struggle still warm our hearts; they warm the heart of every Asian because the memories of past colonialism are still vivid in his mind. So, nationalism is still a live force in every part of Asia. A movement must define itself in terms of nationalism, if it has to become real to the people. In any Asian country, a movement will succeed or fail in the measure that it associates itself with the deep-seated urge of nationalism. If you go against it, whatever the merits of your remedy or your reform, they will not be appreciated. I am often asked by people from abroad as to what my reaction to communism is. The answer has of necessity to be complicated but they become annoyed that we do not see the great danger facing the world. We do see dangers, many of them, both within and without. For instance, when Indonesia was struggling for its freedom, it seemed monstrous to us that any country should support the cause of imperialism. Communism or no communism, we just could not understand the attitude which some of the countries adopted. Fortunately, in the end the right counsel prevailed and Indonesian nationalism found support in many quarters. No argument in any country in Asia is going to carry weight

if it goes counter to national aspirations. After all, this is only understandable.

I do not necessarily consider nationalism to be a commendable ideology. It may or may not be healthy. I wish to stress its importance only because in large parts of Asia today it is a factor which must be recognized. It will, perhaps, be good to remember that it is often based or intimately associated in people's minds with the memory of colonialism in the past. Anything that revives this memory produces a strong reaction.

I am aware that some of you here are experts on these subjects. I have, however, presumed to say something on this subject, because during my lifetime I have dabbled in many subjects, though I am not an expert in any of them. I have come in contact with vast masses of human beings here in this country and elsewhere, have tried to understand them and to influence them and in turn been influenced by them. I have also tried to understand people with diverse views. I could have, perhaps, understood them better if I had the great advantage of being as scholarly as many of you are.

I have not the faintest idea what India will be like ten or twenty years hence. Speaking as the Prime Minister of India, I can tell you what I want it to be and I have some confidence in my ability to direct people along the right road but I cannot predict as to what the future of this country will be. I can do no more than do my job to the best of my ability and with as much energy as I possess.

I have no doubt that your discussions will conduce to a better understanding among the nations of the world. You should also, I feel, inquire into the attitudes that make it difficult for people to approach problems dispassionately. Speaking of India, I can say that by modern standards, we are weak militarily, economically and in other ways, although our potential resources are vast. At the present moment I have not a shadow of fear for what may happen to the world. I think that, to some extent, my people share this attitude. I should like to tell you that we, under the guidance of a great leader, faced a mighty empire unarmed and apparently without any means of achieving our aims. We learnt from

our leader not to be afraid of an opponent. If we are not overwhelmed by the fear that pervades large parts of the world, it is not for any lack of realization of the dangers with which we are all faced but because we have learnt how to face them during the last thirty years. Now, when nations have entered the realm of warfare and developed a military mind, they are prepared to take extreme steps but while fighting a war they lose sight of the objective. Perhaps, the last war lasted much longer than it should have. At least some people think that it might have ended earlier if the desire to fight it to the end had not existed.

If you have the time and opportunity I would advise you to read an ancient Sanskrit play, written in the fifth century. It is a political play and deals particularly with the problems of peace and war. The great Indian who was the hero of the play was a master not only of statecraft but also of war. He waged war, established a powerful empire and came to the conclusion that the real objective of war was not victory. Fighting a war was only the means of gaining an objective. If the objective itself is lost, then new problems arise at the end of the war.

It must be admitted that in the world today wars have to be fought. Sometimes they are big wars; at others, they are not so big. But remember that they are bad and they must be stopped because they corrupt us and, by ever creating new problems, make our future even more uncertain. That, surely, is the lesson the last two great wars have taught us. Apparently, we have failed to learn it because people have already started to talk of a third world war. It is time we thought of that lesson. We must not rush into adventures which might lead us into the catastrophe of a third world war. Ultimately, of course, the question is one of our having enough wisdom to prevent wars. We have rich stores of knowledge and we have universities and all kinds of institutions for imparting this knowledge to others but sometimes one wonders whether we are really growing in wisdom.

I am reminded of what a great Greek poet said long ago:

What else is Wisdom? What of man's endeavour,

Or God's high grace, so lovely and so great?

To stand from fear set free, to breathe and wait;
To hold a hand uplifted over Hate;
And shall not Loveliness be loved for ever?

PEACE OR WAR

I HAVE always welcomed a debate on foreign affairs in this House because they are no longer the concern merely of experts and specialists. Foreign affairs concern almost every human being now and an event in one part of the world may have consequences which affect people in another. Foreign affairs are the concern of this House, in particular, because on it rests the great responsibility for both domestic and international affairs.

I further welcome this opportunity of discussing the international situation because the world, as the House well knows, is passing through a very grave crisis.

At this moment, it is especially desirable that the deepest understanding should exist between the Government and the country which this House represents, so that any policy we undertake has the fullest possible co-operation and support. I wish to say, however, that I am somewhat overwhelmed by a sense of responsibility on this occasion. I am also hesitant because it is difficult to talk of foreign affairs without hurting an individual or a people or a country. I am convinced that if we start blaming one another at this moment, it will not only fail to serve any useful purpose but will actually stand in the way of our objectives.

As it is, there has been enough of recrimination and, even if it was occasionally justified, it certainly did not help in easing the situation. Not only have we to deal with Governments but also with mass psychology, with the inflamed passions of millions of people. Blame and censure do not help much when that is the position. Are we trying to find a

peaceful way out of a terrible difficulty or only trying to justify the action that we have already taken? This is a question that sometimes bothers me. I think all of us, wherever we might be, have to bear in some measure the responsibility for the state the world is in today. Our most urgent need today is charity of thought and the touch of healing. Unfortunately for all of us, the great healer under whose care we grew up is no more; and that is not only our misfortune but that of the whole world.

A single phrase can sum up what is, today, the foremost issue in international affairs—peace or war. The latter, if it comes, will be an overwhelming and all-enveloping war, a war which may well bring utter destruction to the world and which will probably ruin the proud structure of modern civilization. What we are discussing, therefore, is a matter of the greatest import and consequence. My attitude is one of earnestness and humility and I wish to say frankly that I have no easy remedy. All we can do is to grope in the dim twilight for something that will, perhaps, prevent the twilight from becoming dark night. It is difficult to say, whether or not we will succeed; but, in any event, it is our duty to try our utmost to avert a third world war.

I am sure that people all over the world want peace and are anxious to avoid war. I am equally sure that every government wants to avoid war. And yet, we drift towards the very thing we seek to avoid. Fear and suspicion have us in their grip; every step that one party takes adds to the fear and suspicion of another and so catastrophe comes inevitably nearer as in a Greek tragedy. I do believe, however, that, if the peoples or rather the governments of the world try hard enough, this catastrophe can be avoided, although it becomes increasingly difficult to do so.

When we discuss foreign affairs, many subjects concerning life here in this country come up for discussion. One of these—and it is of primary importance for us—is our relations with Pakistan. I do not propose to say much or indeed anything on that subject in this debate, partly because we have discussed it many times and I have given you such information as I have on several occasions. If and when any new

development takes place, I shall certainly take the House into my confidence. It is obvious that our relations with Pakistan, as those with any neighbouring country, are of extreme importance.

Foreign possessions in India are another question which has agitated and excited this House in the past. They are small areas without much territorial or economic importance. Nevertheless, they raise big questions on which we have strong feelings. In regard to these foreign possessions, I think, we have set an extraordinary example of restraint. For more than three years, we have reasoned, we have argued and we have used peaceful methods all without any result. We know, of course, that ultimately there can be only one result. We cannot, conceive and, indeed, can never tolerate the idea that any foreign footholds should remain in India. I submit to the House that our manner of proceeding in regard to the foreign possessions is evidence not only of our peaceful intentions but also of the enormous patience with which we approach such problems.

The question of Indians in South Africa was recently before the United Nations. It has once again raised issues that are vital not only for us but for the whole world. If I may say so, it is the issue of racialism that is of paramount importance. We are intimately concerned with the people of Indian origin who settled in South Africa and who have become South African citizens. We have nothing to do with them politically but we have cultural links. Since the issue of racialism involves the self-respect of India and the Indian people, indeed of all the peoples of Asia, it has assumed tremendous importance for us. You will observe the patience we have shown in this matter and keep in mind how we have argued patiently year after year, tried to make people understand and taken the question to the United Nations. You must also realize that we have tried our best to fulfil the directions issued by UNO in accordance with the resolutions passed by them. Now, another resolution has recently been passed. What this will lead to, I do not know but one thing is certain. Regardless of how long it takes us to settle the issue, we shall not submit to racialism in any part of the world.

I shall now come to the main theme of my address, which is the situation that has arisen in the Far East. The incursion from North Korea into South Korea was brought to the notice of the United Nations and was described by the Security Council as an act of aggression. We supported that decision and gave our vote accordingly. Subsequently, other developments took place. There was the 'Six-Power Resolution' and the 'Seven-Power Resolution' but for a variety of reasons, which I think I have placed before the House from time to time, we could not support every step that was taken. Confused and distressed at the situation which was growing more and more difficult, I had the temerity to address an appeal to Marshal Stalin on the one hand and to Mr Acheson on the other. It was not an attempt at mediation, for we have never thought in those terms. I made the appeal in the vague hope that, perhaps, it might result in something positive. The former contained the suggestion that China might be admitted to the United Nations and that the U.S.S.R. might also return to the Security Council. The fact that we had recognized the People's Government of China naturally implied that, so far as we were concerned, China should be a part of the United Nations. In the context in which I suggested it to Marshal Stalin and Mr Acheson, however, the emphasis was on its urgency rather than on the rights and wrongs of the matter. We further believed that the situation in the Far East could only be dealt with satisfactorily if the principal parties concerned agreed to sit round a conference table.

The United Nations is a great and powerful organization and it has a Charter that lays down its ideals and objectives in language so impressive that it can hardly be bettered. The United Nations was founded for the great nations as well as the small. We thought it was necessary that the representatives of the great countries most concerned with the crisis in Korea should be able to meet at the United Nations. Without such a step there was every danger that the position would worsen, as, indeed, it has done. It was with this point of view that I made the appeal to Russia and to the United States of America. It was unfortunate that it

did not have any fruitful results.

Subsequently, the aggression by North Korea was checked and the North Korean armies pushed back till they seemed to be completely broken. The forces of the United Nations appeared to have won total victory, as, indeed, they had. This victory, inevitably, gave rise to certain fundamental questions. Should the forces of the United Nations continue to advance? If so, how far they should go? We consulted our Ambassador in Peking and our representatives in other countries about how the various Governments were viewing the scene. We had, perhaps, a rather special responsibility in regard to China, because we were one of the very few countries represented there. Furthermore, we were the only country, besides the countries of the Soviet group, which was in a position to find out through its Ambassador what the reactions of the Chinese Government to the developing events were. Since we were anxious that the other countries with whom we were co-operating should know these views, we sent them on to the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States.

The Chinese Government clearly indicated that if the 38th Parallel was crossed, they would consider it a grave danger to their own security and that they would not tolerate it. Whether their view was right or wrong is not the point. However, it was decided that the forces of the United Nations should advance beyond the 38th Parallel. They did so and came into conflict with re-organized North Korean troops and, at a later stage, with the Chinese forces. The Chinese Government described the latter as volunteers but, according to information received, they were regular Chinese troops. The distinction is not very important; it has little bearing because a large number of these volunteers or Chinese soldiers—call them what you will—did come across the Manchurian border into North Korea and threaten the UN troops to such an extent that the latter are in grave danger at the moment and are withdrawing.

It will not do us much good to think of what might have been done or to dwell on the errors committed in the political field or in other fields. The situation we have to face is chang-

ing so rapidly that it is very difficult to suggest any measures for its improvement. I realize that the suggestions I had in mind four, five or six days ago are out of date today. They do not fit in with the circumstances and alternatives have to be thought of. We did, as a matter of fact, convey our views to the Governments of the United Kingdom, the United States of America as well as to some Governments in Asia. Some of these Governments have been good enough to tell us what they have in mind and what they propose to do. But, as I said, the situation is changing very rapidly, indeed. A step we envisage today will probably become obsolete and impracticable the next day.

We realize that it will be very harmful if this matter is considered in the United Nations at a purely formal level and if resolutions of condemnation are passed. The House will remember that one of the first things suggested by the Chinese delegation was that a resolution of condemnation be passed against the United Nations or the U.S.A. On the other hand, resolutions condemning China and calling her an aggressor have also been repeatedly suggested.

The point is that we are on the very verge of a world war and obviously, it does not help in the slightest to call each other names. If we want a war to come sooner rather than later and if the present situation is merely a manoeuvre to provide political justification for military action, then, of course, no more need be said; but if we seek to avoid war, then we must avoid the kind of approach that creates bitterness. The only possible way is that of peaceful negotiation. The negotiations may fail but there is no other way except war. It was clear to us that no negotiation would have any value unless China was associated with it. China, apart from being a great Power, is most intimately concerned with the events happening next door to her. We suggested that there should be a cease-fire and, if possible, a demilitarized zone where negotiations among the parties concerned, including China, could take place—negotiations, not merely about what should follow the cease-fire but about the entire Korean problem as well. It had also seemed essential to us that, at a later stage in the negotiations, the questions of Formosa

should also be considered. Without that, no peace could last. One cannot carry on negotiations unless the fighting stops. Therefore, a cease-fire appears desirable; whether it is possible or not, is another matter.

We welcomed the decision of the Prime Minister of England to go to the United States, to meet President Truman and wished him God speed in his endeavours to prevent war and to find a peaceful way out of this tangle. We found that there was a good deal in common between the British Prime Minister's view of the present situation and ours. We let him have our own viewpoint in detail in case he needed it during the discussions with President Truman. We also informed other Governments in Asia who were friendly to us as to what we feel about the Korean situation.

During the last few months, a great deal has happened in Korea. Everybody talks of the freedom, the unity and independence of Korea. The forces that are fighting the United Nations say more or less the same thing but the result of this unanimity of approach, if I may say so, is this: Korea is a dying and desolate country. Only this morning I have had a letter from a Korean lady in Seoul who has lived through the horror that has prevailed these many months. In her letter, which I would like to read out to you, there is a phrase: "my country is sick and dying of cold, disease and starvation".

It is extraordinary that we should seek to help our friends in ways which kill or destroy them. It is, indeed, a strange commentary on the way of violence which we are somehow forced to adopt in the present world. This commentary will be complete when the third world war comes and we all sink into ruin and oblivion. It is about time we changed our attitude to the problems of the world. I wish we did not overwhelm ourselves with passion and anger at the critical time; we should, instead, look to our own actions and learn again the ancient lesson that wrong doing cannot be counteracted by further wrong doing; nor can violence be ultimately conquered by violence. I know how easy it is to talk in terms of pious platitudes but we must make every effort to benefit from what is true in them.

There is another bitter truth we have to understand and realize today. In the fighting in Korea, the main burden of the United Nations has fallen on the forces of the United States. They have suffered greatly and I think our sympathy should go out to them. We have, as I have pointed out, adopted a definite attitude to North Korea and, although we did not support all the resolutions of the United Nations or the Security Council, our attitude to the aggression has remained basically the same. We did not support the Six-Power and the Seven-Power Resolutions because we felt that they would not help in solving the problem. On the contrary, we believed that they would only increase the tension and further inflame the passions of both the States. For the same reason, we did not join the *Seven-Power Commission set up in accordance with one of these resolutions*. Not that we wished to shirk our responsibility or duty; but we felt we could only discharge our duty and responsibility adequately if our approach or mood, if I may say so, was not merely one of condemnation.

I want you to realize that what happens in Korea is of the utmost significance to the Chinese people also. One cannot ignore that fact, unless one is prepared to ignore completely China and the Chinese people—and the latter are not a mere handful. We have always been of the opinion that the problem of Korea can only be solved with China's co-operation. Whatever the result of the Korean conflict might be in the military sense, the problem cannot be finally solved without the acquiescence, if not the active co-operation, of China. We laid stress on this fact right at the beginning. That was one of the reasons why we felt that China should be represented at the United Nations; and the issue at stake was an urgent one.

The military situation in Korea has again undergone a considerable change and I just cannot make a profitable suggestion as to what should be done now. I can only hope that the negotiations between President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee will bear fruit and lead to some peaceful way out of this predicament. In any case, I cannot conceive of a peaceful solution in the Far East, unless the great country of China is taken into account.

I mentioned Formosa earlier. Formosa is not what might be called an immediate issue but it is tied up with the other problems of the Far East and has to be considered urgently on that score. You will remember that some of the great Powers made declarations concerning Formosa in Cairo and Potsdam. President Truman made a very forthright declaration earlier this year. I feel that we must proceed on the basis of these declarations. What exactly our manner of proceeding should be is a matter for careful consideration.

I would like to say one more thing. There has been a good deal of talk about the atomic bomb. I need hardly say much about it. I am sure no one in this House approves of the idea of using the atomic bomb anywhere at any time and much less so in the particular context of the war in the Far East. In the morning newspapers today, there was a statement by Mr Pearson, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Canada, in which he spoke of the atomic bomb. I cannot say anything more forceful than what Mr Pearson has said in the matter. He has pointed out the grave dangers of using it, particularly in Asia. Apart from the horrors that are inherent in it, it has become a symbol of evil. If the stress of circumstances compels the world to use it, it means that the latter has yielded completely to evil. Therefore, I earnestly hope that there will be no question now or hereafter of the use of the atom bomb.

I should like to say a few words about two other neighbouring countries—Tibet and Nepal. Some questions were asked earlier this morning in regard to the advance of the Chinese forces into Tibet. I could not give much information then; nor can I do so now. The story of Tibet, so far as we are concerned, is very simple. I am going into past history. Ever since the People's Government of China talked about the liberation of Tibet, our Ambassador told them, on behalf of the Government of India, how the latter felt about it. We expressed our earnest hope that the matter would be settled peacefully by China and Tibet. We also made it clear that we had no territorial or political ambitions in regard to Tibet and that our relations were cultural and commercial. We said that we would naturally like to preserve these

relations and continue to trade with Tibet because it did not come in the way of either China or Tibet. We further said that we were anxious that Tibet should maintain the autonomy it has had for at least the last forty years. We did not challenge or deny the suzerainty of China over Tibet. We pointed all this out in a friendly way to the Chinese Government. In their replies, they always said that they would very much like to settle the question peacefully but that they were, in any event, going to liberate Tibet. From whom they were going to liberate Tibet is, however, not quite clear. They gave us to understand that a peaceful solution would be found, though I must say that they gave us no assurance or guarantee to the effect. On the one hand, they said they were prepared for a peaceful solution; on the other, they talked persistently of liberation.

We had come to believe that the matter would be settled by peaceful negotiation and were shocked when we heard that the Chinese armies were marching into Tibet. Indeed, one can hardly talk about war between China and Tibet. Tibet is not in a position to carry on war and, obviously, Tibet is no threat to China. It is said that other countries might intrigue in Tibet. I cannot say much about it because I do not know. It is certain, however, that there was no immediate threat. Violence might, perhaps, be justified in the modern world but one should not resort to it unless there is no other way. There was another way in Tibet as we pointed out. That is why the action of China came to us as a surprise.

The House is aware of the correspondence that was exchanged between the Chinese Government and our Government. We have continued to press upon them that it would be desirable for them to halt their advances and settle matters with Tibetan representatives peacefully. There is no doubt that during the last few weeks they have checked their main advance. However, I cannot say for certain what their future intentions are. Some small groups may have continued to advance in some places but so far as we know there has been no advance towards Lhasa, where conditions are still normal. That, of course, does not mean that the problem is solved.

Coming to Nepal, I must say that it has been the scene of strange developments during the last fortnight. Ever since I have been associated with this Government, I have taken a great deal of interest in Nepal. We have desired, not only to continue our old friendship with that country but to put it on a still firmer footing. We have inherited both good things and bad from the British. Our relations with some of our neighbouring countries developed during an expansive phase of British imperial policy. Nepal was an independent country when India was under British rule; but, strictly speaking, her independence was only formal. The test of the independence of a country is that it should be able to have relations with other countries without endangering that independence. Nepal's foreign relations were strictly limited to her relations with the Government functioning in India at the time. That was an indication that Nepal's approach to international relations was a very limited one.

When we came into the picture, we assured Nepal that we would not only respect her independence but see, as far as we could, that she developed into a strong and progressive country. We went further in this respect than the British Government had done and Nepal began to develop other foreign relations. We welcomed this and did not hinder the process as the British had done. Frankly, we do not like and shall not brook any foreign interference in Nepal. We recognize Nepal as an independent country and wish her well. But even a child knows that one cannot go to Nepal without passing through India. Therefore, no other country can have as intimate a relationship with Nepal as ours is. We would like every other country to appreciate the intimate geographical and cultural relationship that exists between India and Nepal.

Three years ago, we assured Nepal of our desire that she should be a strong, independent and progressive country. In the nature of things, we stood not only for progressive democracy in our own country but also in other countries. We have said this not only to Nepal but it has consistently been a part of our policy in distant quarters of the world. We are certainly not going to forget this when one of our

neighbouring countries is concerned.

We pointed out in as friendly a way as possible that the world was changing rapidly and if Nepal did not make an effort to keep pace with it, circumstances were bound to force her to do so. It was difficult for us to make this clear because we did not wish to interfere with Nepal in any way.

We wished to treat Nepal as an independent country but, at the same time, saw that, unless some steps were taken in the internal sphere, difficulties might arise. Our advice, given in all friendship, did not, however, produce any result. During the last fortnight, some new developments have taken place in Nepal. Our interest in the internal conditions of Nepal has become still more acute and personal, because of the developments across our borders, to be frank, especially those in China and Tibet. Besides our sympathetic interest in Nepal, we were also interested in the security of our own country. From time immemorial, the Himalayas have provided us with a magnificent frontier. Of course, they are no longer as impassable as they used to be but are still fairly effective. We cannot allow that barrier to be penetrated because it is also the principal barrier to India. Therefore, much as we appreciate the independence of Nepal, we cannot allow anything to go wrong in Nepal or permit that barrier to be crossed or weakened, because that would be a risk to our own security. The recent developments have made us ponder more deeply over the Nepal situation than we had done previously. All this time, however, we had functioned in our own patient way, advising in a friendly way and pointing out the difficulties inherent in the situation in a spirit of co-operation.

As the House knows, the King of Nepal is, at the present moment, in Delhi along with two other members of the Nepalese Government. The talks we have had with them have yielded no results thus far. May I, in this connection, warn this House not to rely too much on the statements that appear in the newspapers? Nowadays, they have seldom any basis in fact.

Needless to say, we pointed out to the Ministers who have come here that, above all, we desire a strong progressive and independent Nepal. In fact, our chief need—not only

our need but also that of the whole world—is peace and stability. Having said that, I should also like to add that we are convinced that return to the old order will not bring peace and stability to Nepal.

We have tried, for what it is worth, to advise Nepal to act in a manner so as to prevent any major upheaval. We have tried to find a way, a middle way, if you like, which will ensure the progress of Nepal and the introduction of, or some advance in, the ways of democracy in Nepal. We have searched for a way which would, at the same time, avoid the total uprooting of the ancient order. Whether or not it is possible to find such a way, I do not know.

I would like to say one more thing in regard to the King of Nepal. There has also been a good deal in the newspapers about our recognition of the King of Nepal. When our Ambassador to Nepal presented his credentials, he did so to the King, although during the last hundred years or so the King has had no say in any matter. Nevertheless, because of international conventions our Ambassador had to go to the King as the head of the State as did the Ambassadors of other countries. The fact that Nepal has now entered into diplomatic relations with many other nations has raised questions about his status in each case. To say that we recognize the King, as such, has no meaning. We went to the King because he was considered to be the official head of the State.

We shall continue to recognize the King and I see no reason why we should do anything else.

We are a patient Government. Perhaps, we are too patient sometimes. I feel, however, that if this matter drags on it will not be good for Nepal and it might even make it more difficult to find the middle way we have been advocating.

We, in this country, speak a good deal of foreign affairs and offer advice, for what it is worth, to other countries. But the fact remains that such value as our advice may have is only moral or psychological. The fate of the world depends far more on the great Powers, on what they do and do not do. The fate of the world depends more on the U.S.A., the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and China than on the rest of the world put together. I should like to make an

earnest appeal to these great countries to make every effort to solve the present tangle by negotiations or other peaceful means. The consequences of not doing so are too terrible to contemplate. The irony of the situation is, in fact, that people in every country desire peace; but at the present moment, some evil fate seems to pursue humanity. It is driving mankind in a direction which can only end in stark ruin. So, I hope that these great countries will apply themselves to securing peace and I am sure the House will join me in this appeal. On behalf of my Government and, if I may say so, this House, I should like to make a pledge, namely, that we will do everything in our power to promote peace and to avoid war.

THE GROWTH OF VIOLENCE

THIS TWO days' debate has ended in a somewhat unusual manner and for the moment such thoughts as I have are rather diffused. I have listened with great attention to what hon. Members have said during these two days and I am thankful to some of them who had words of commendation for me. I am still more thankful to those who had words of criticism against me or against the policy we have pursued. The debate has covered many subjects and the expression of opinion has varied greatly. As the House will see there was at one end Mr M. R. Masani and at the other end Mr Brijeshwar Prasad while the others ranged between these two extremes.

I don't quite know whether I should deal with all the points that have been raised. I think it might be better if I chose some of the most important of them and dealt with these. We have been discussing grave matters and though hilarity is sometimes in place, it is not suitable at others. The subject we have discussed is of the greatest importance. During the discussion we have been oppressed by a sense of tragedy and

possible catastrophe. As I sat listening to the speeches of hon. Members, many pictures floated before my mind; pictures of the Korean battlefields, of marching armies and dying people, of statesmen holding earnest converse in a room in Washington to find a way out of the present predicament and countless other pictures.

There is hardly anybody concerned with foreign affairs who is not carrying a heavy burden and not trying to grope for solution of our problems. I use the word 'grobe', because darkness surrounds us. Some hon. Members are full of light—they have no need to grope. They know exactly what should be done at any given moment. I envy them for this feeling of lightness and confidence. Mr M. R. Masani said in the course of his speech that it would be a great tragedy if Mr Truman and Mr Attlee decided to appease China. It is a pity Mr Masani is not at the White House in Washington to advise them.

Many hon. Members have repeatedly referred to our policy as being unrealistic; there have been hints that we are sitting on the fence and that we are doubtful and uncertain. It seems to me that the people who pride themselves on being practical politicians normally know nothing of the existing state of affairs or of the questions they will be called upon to answer. It is easy enough to say that our policy is not realistic. It is also easy to say that we are uncertain and inconsistent. Anyway, it is not for me to boast of the policy of a government with which I have been associated.

Our foreign policy, naturally, has to do with world affairs but if any hon. Member thinks that the Government of India moulds world affairs he is very much mistaken. I do not say that we cannot or have not affected the world to some extent. But obviously, we affect or influence it in a very small measure. If the world goes wrong, then it may, of course, be due to some error of ours but surely it would be the resultant of a large number of policies, in particular the policies of the powerful and influential countries that dominate the policies of the smaller and weaker countries.

Some hon. Members seem to think that because the policies of other countries have failed, our policy must have

been wrong. I have little to say to that but I would beg of the hon. Members to look at the history of the past five years. Since the last world war ended, the policies that have been pursued by various countries have failed more often than not. We have had little to do with these policies. We have expressed an opinion at best. Sometimes we have played a passive role, sometimes, a small active role. But there are moments when even a small thing can make all the difference.

Before I deal with the larger questions, I should like to take up some matters that were brought up as interpellations. Many hon. Members seem anxious that we should not weaken our defence. Indeed, they talked of re-armament and of increasing the strength of our Army, Navy and Air Force. They were afraid that we might neglect them.

I should like to say something about this and the first thing is that no government in this country can possibly treat the question of defence lightly or allow it to weaken at any time. Every government must give priority to the defence of the country. But what is defence? Most people seem to imagine that defence consists in large numbers of people marching up and down with guns. It is true that armed men and machines constitute defence. Defence means many other things, too. It includes the industrial potential of a country, the morale of a country and the like. All this has to balance with the capacity and resources of the country and you cannot upset this balance very much. You cannot overstrain the capacity and the resources of a country without dire consequences. What you can do to strengthen your defences further, without upsetting anything, is to better your morale and be determined not to surrender, whatever the danger. If you do that, nothing can conquer you. But on the contrary, if you rely too much on men with guns and lose your moral fibre, then you are done for.

Therefore, when you talk of defence, remember your resources; remember your capacity; and remember that defence consists of the economic position of a country, of the industrial potential of a country and of the defence forces. Of course, it is possible to change the equation a little but these are, broadly speaking, the limitations you have to work

within. Any defence force that cannot, more or less, provide its own equipment, is not independent. There is no harm in this, except in a crisis when the things for which the armed forces depend on others are not available.

In other words, the real strength of a country lies in her industrial resources. The strength of the defence forces and everything connected with them depends on the development of these resources. If not, then defence is just a superficial thing which can be kept up by borrowing money but has no basic strength. In these times of financial stringency we have to consider whether twenty thousand odd men with guns are more to our advantage than something more efficient.

It is true that no government dare take chances with the defence of the country. But I would beg the hon. Members who talk so much of defence and of danger to the country to consider the question in another light. When there is danger, how will you fight, with the best army in the world, if you cannot feed it? Thus, defence becomes a food problem also. It is not only a matter for guns. A hungry army cannot fight. Hungry people behind an army are bad material. It is difficult to fight both on the home front and on the battle front. The food problem, therefore, comes first of all, whatever the issue. The problem of industrial development and growth becomes equally important in order to build up the resources necessary for defence. All these necessities are linked and not one item can be considered in isolation. We cannot afford to concentrate on defence at the cost of everything else. If we do that then our defence will also fall through because there will be no foundation for it.

The food problem has been discussed often enough in this House. So have the sugar problem and the controls; and the discussions have caused a great deal of excitement. I regret that the sense of urgency that ought to exist in this House and in the country is not there. We talk so much about controls but if there is shortage of sugar, there are protests all over the country. If that is our attitude, how can we talk of defence? A country that cannot put up with a few controls, a country that cannot do without sugar, cannot face the enemy at a critical moment. We in India

live in times of grave crisis and in such times people have to give up everything that they hold dear—sometimes even their families.

If you cannot give up your sugar, your wheat or your rice for a while, then the biggest army will not be able to protect you, because you lack inner strength. Of course, we must have the best army. It is no good maintaining a second-rate or a weak army. But we cannot do this at the cost of our people. We must, at the same time, be able to feed them and also not let the economic position or the industrial growth of the country suffer. We have to achieve a balance and try to advance as rapidly as we can. That does not ultimately depend on Government decrees. It may to some extent depend on law. What it really depends on is the reaction of the public and the House to these questions.

In the context of the present world situation, food is the most urgent and important need in this country today. We must grow it, save it and not waste it but preserve it at all costs.

Having achieved independence, we in this country seem to have grown somewhat lax in our thought and deed during the last few years. But I do not think we have lost the moral fibre that brought us our independence. We did not weaken or succumb when we were struggling for our freedom and I doubt if we will now. Even if we do not have a single gun, we are determined to fight to the end. We shall not surrender to any aggressor whatsoever. I do not wish to indulge in tall talk; and after a while this kind of thing does become tall talk. We must plan and think carefully and realize the difficulties of the situation.

Listening to the speeches of other hon. Members, I felt that some of them talked in what I consider a most unrealistic fashion. They talked at length of power blocs and argued whether there were two blocs or only one. Mr Masani felt that there was only one bloc. If there is only one bloc, the matter ends there; the question of our joining one or the other does not arise.

I should like to remind the House with all respect that these questions and arguments are completely out of date

They do not count today. The world marches rapidly and changes, new situations develop and we have to deal with each situation as it comes. For a person to think in terms of blocs today means that he is yesterday's man and that he is not keeping pace with the changes in the world.

We have to deal with matters as they come up. In matters of foreign policy especially, one has to decide almost every hour what has to be done. We had this debate in the House, because new situations have arisen and new dangers threaten the world. We wanted the counsel of the House as to what our line of action should be. We also wanted to make clear what policy, generally speaking, we were pursuing.

I fear that we in this country, somehow or other, don't keep pace with events. We read about them in the newspapers but we have fallen into fixed habits of thinking which we do not overcome, however much the world changes. It is no good telling me that you dislike Russia or China or that you dislike the United States of America or the United Kingdom. We have to deal with a situation that actually exists. Facts are facts and will not disappear on account of your likes or dislikes.

Military changes have taken place in Korea. All kinds of dangerous things are happening. You cannot meet that situation by simply expressing your strong disapproval of the changes. What would you do if you were in a responsible position and were called upon to act? Deliver a speech telling people what you like and dislike and which bloc you belong to? That won't help anybody in the slightest.

It is in a spirit of realism that I want you to approach the question of our foreign policy. I am sure it is in the same spirit that President Truman and Mr Attlee are meeting in Washington and conferring together. They have to deal with a positive situation, they have to issue orders and they have to decide what is to be done or not done. They cannot afford to talk of vague theoretical things and waste their time with "idealistic" or "moral" approaches to the situation.

I hope there is nothing immoral about the part I have played in our foreign policy. In any case, I want no moralizing, especially about this. As it is, there is far too much

moralizing in the country. People think that if they have used a few moral words or slogans they have discharged their duty. We should use our good sense as much as possible. Idealism alone will not do. What exactly is idealism? Surely it is not something so insubstantial as to elude one's grasp! Idealism is the realism of tomorrow. It is the capacity to know what is good for the day after tomorrow or for the next year and to fashion yourself accordingly. The practical person, the realist, looks at the tip of his nose and sees little beyond; the result is that he is stumbling all the time.

I should like the Members of this House to consider the last five or six years of diplomatic history. In spite of every effort, the world has repeatedly failed to achieve harmony. The astonishing thing is that failure does not teach us a lesson and we make the same mistakes over again. This is really extraordinary. I should have thought that the lesson of the two great world wars was obvious enough to anybody willing to give thought to it. Apparently, it is not at all obvious because the same path is still followed.

It may be that the crisis today is due to the fault of a nation or a group of nations. It may be Russia's fault or the fault of the communist group of nations. What do we do when a group of nations functions in an objectionable way?

People talk a great deal about communism and as an hon. Member pointed out, some Members thought that we had turned this discussion into an anti-communist conference. Communism is certainly an interesting subject and one that is worthy of discussion but it does not have much bearing on the issue. I am sure that those who think only in terms of communism and anti-communism are going hopelessly astray and will never reach any goal. The difficulty is that much of the thinking—not so much here as elsewhere—revolves round these words.

The House knows very well what the policy of the Government of India has been in regard to communist activities in this country. It has not been a tender policy and it is not going to be a tender policy. We must look at the world as it is and recognize that mighty forces are at work and millions of people have come under their influence. We must try to

understand them and try as far as we can to divert them into right channels and prevent them from going into wrong ones. That is our problem. Some hon. Members seem to think that I should issue an ultimatum to China, that I should warn them not to do this or that or that I should send them a letter saying that it is foolish to follow the doctrine of communism. I do not see how it is going to help anybody if I act in this way. Remember, the world has many countries. Some of them are called Great Powers by virtue of their influence. They are nations with great resources behind them and inevitably play a significant part in the world's history today.

The United States of America is a great democratic Power. The United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R., even though their policies differ, greatly influence the world's history and no one can deny China the status of a Great Power today. China is in a position to shape her own destiny and that is a great thing. It is true that she is controlled by communists as Russia is. It would be interesting to know whether or not her type of communism is the same as Russia's, how she will develop and how close the association between China and Russia will be.

The point at issue is that China is a great nation which cannot be ignored, no matter what resolution you may pass. Nor can you ignore the United States of America. Some people talk of American imperialism and American dollars in a hostile fashion. You cannot condemn or ignore the whole nation just because you do not approve of some aspect of the myriad shapes of American life. We have to take facts as they are. The most relevant fact at the moment is that there are some great nations in this world with concentrated power in their hands that influence all the other nations. That being so, there is a conflict between these powerful nations—an ideological conflict as well as a political conflict. Either these nations will have a war and try to suppress or defeat one another or one group will triumph over the other. There seems to be no other way. Although there is a great deal of talk about ideologies, I doubt if they come into the picture at all except as weapons.

The only way seems to be the avoidance of war. All nations must be free to develop as they like without any external interference. This does not mean that they will not influence one another in a variety of ways. It is possible that the existing contradictions may gradually be solved in that manner. On the other hand, they may not. I am not a prophet; I do not know. In any case, the way of war does not solve them. The concentration of power in the hands of these great nations and the fact that the power is not too unevenly matched, means a very disastrous war. It also means no ultimate victory. There may be a military victory; but there will be no real victory, if by victory you mean the achievement of certain objectives.

I doubt if, after the terrible disaster of a world war, democracy can survive. The democratic nations may win the war—mind you, I have little doubt that they will—but I doubt if after the disaster of a world war democracy can survive at all. I even doubt whether any high standards of living can survive. I have no doubt that the great nations wish to avoid war because they are aware of its consequences. No one can assert that America wants war. I cannot imagine anything more unlikely. If America wanted war, who could have stopped her? She obviously does not. She wants to avoid war because she is aware of the great disasters a world war will cause. England also wants to avoid war. In spite of this, forces are impelling these nations in a direction which may lead to war. The biggest task today is to prevent that and that is the task for England, for America, for us and for all other countries.

I do not know what people mean when they talk of this or that group; nor do I understand them when they accuse our Government of sitting on the fence in matters of foreign policy. People who talk like that know nothing of what they are talking about and do not study or read or understand what is happening around them. I have repeatedly said in this House that I have no desire to get entangled in foreign affairs. That is not my ambition. My work in this country is big enough and difficult enough. But in spite of our policy, we sometimes cannot help getting entangled in foreign affairs.

I suppose some Hon. Members think that taking part in foreign affairs means delivering impassioned orations, condemning something or other. It is true that we have not done that; nor do we propose to do that in the future. The way we participate in world affairs is to take part daily and hourly in the deliberations at the United Nations, at Lake Success and in the various capitals of the world. I should like to say that we have been served very well by our representatives in the important capitals of the world. They are often criticized but it is difficult for them to reply to that criticism; nor is it easy for me to talk about our Ambassadors. But I want to say clearly that we have been served very well by our Ambassadors at Lake Success, in Washington, in London, in Peking and in Moscow.

You might have read in the newspapers about the initiative that our representatives at Lake Success took in common with a large number of other Asian representatives and put up a proposal that the Chinese Government be asked to agree to a cease-fire and to give assurances that they would not go beyond 38th Parallel. We talked about the 38th Parallel in another connection some time ago. The roles are reversed for the moment and they may be reversed again. It is not realistic to talk as if nothing had happened. Our representative, Sri B. N. Rau, made this proposal and the representatives of almost every Asian country agreed to support it. I do not know what the reaction of the Chinese Government will be but I welcome the initiative of our representatives and I am quite sure that every peace-loving individual, whatever he may be, will welcome it and that the Governments of the U.S.A. and U.K. will welcome it, too. This does not solve any problem. The problems are too big to be solved this way; but when you are driving hard towards catastrophe and disaster, every move of this kind gives you time to consider and negotiate and this is useful and valuable. This, therefore, is a good move and I hope it will succeed. If it does, it will bring relief not only to the harassed people who are actually facing the trouble but also to those people, not less harassed, who have to worry about these matters from a distance.

I had not used the word 'bloc' in my address to this House yesterday but the word has been bandied about a good deal since I spoke. I am not thinking in terms of blocs, because it does not interest me very much. I am only concerned with my policy on each specific issue. Acharya Kripalani accused us of judging each question in isolation from everything else. I am aware that this can only be done in academic talk. No person dealing with realities can afford to do so. In fact, every question that comes before us has to be seen from a hundred different view-points. We have to weigh carefully its possible effects and consequences. I can only say that in every matter that comes up we have friendly consultations with a large number of countries. We do hardly anything without consulting the countries of the Commonwealth. Of course, we are in close touch with the U.S.A. and with other countries. We have been in close contact with the countries of South-East Asia like Burma and Indonesia. They are constantly keeping us informed of what they do. This process goes on all the time with the result that we arrive at a decision which fits in with what a number of countries think. If it does not wholly fit in, we always try to make it fit in. If our view-point is different, you cannot expect me to give up our view-point or the results that we have arrived at because some other nations think differently I just would not do that. I do not understand long and repeated arguments about this. I am on my country's side and on nobody else's.

We have many friends and we collaborate and co-operate with them. But I am not prepared to surrender my judgement or my country's judgement or my country's position to any single country or group of countries. Then again, some people say we are isolated. I do not see how we are isolated when we act with others.

I beg this House to consider Asia specially—Asia in a tremendous ferment of change. One does not know whether that change is good or bad. It may be bad but to my mind it does not concern Asia alone. Many things are taking place which I dislike intensely. I am not, for the moment, talking of war which is bad enough but rather about the temper of people as a whole and of all that one holds precious in life

which gradually seems to be fading out, whichever country you may consider. People have become more brutal in thought, speech and action. All the graciousness and gentleness of life seems to have ebbed away. The human values seem to have suffered considerably. Of course, plenty of human values still remain; I am not saying that everything worthwhile is completely destroyed but I do say that the process of coarsening is going on apace all over the world, including our own country. We are being coarsened and vulgarized all over the world because of many things but chiefly because of violence and the succession of wars. If this process continues, I wonder whether anything of value in life will remain for sensitive individuals.

We talk of victory and defeat, war and peace. Surely, we fight a war to gain some objectives and not merely to boast that we have knocked the other party down. The very objectives for which human life and human society have stood all these years now seem to be challenged. They are challenged sometimes by a theory or an ideology. They are challenged by authoritarianism which crushes the individual and they are challenged even in democratic societies, not by democracy but by this growth of violence and by the mentality that war breeds. In this state of affairs, are we to allow ourselves to be swept away and lose all our integrity of thought or action or should we hold fast to it and try to understand and co-operate with our friends?

Of course, where we feel that there is a wrong course of action, we part company. I do not see how any hon. Member can have any doubt when such a thing happens. One has to follow the right course and follow it regardless of consequences. We talk of possible invasions of India, of our frontiers being threatened, of something that may happen even though far from India, which may be a danger to the world. I hope we have still enough moral fibre and spirit left in us to face any danger not only on the borders of our country but far away, if we think it is a danger to the world.

There are two or three other matters and I will, if I may, deal with them separately. One of them relates to Nepal. My attention has been drawn to the fact that perhaps I was

unjust in what I said about the State of Nepal. My description of the independence of Nepal, I am told, was perhaps not quite correct. I think it was perfectly correct but I have been somewhat misunderstood. What I said yesterday was this, that the independence of a country is ultimately judged by the foreign relations of that country. A country can be completely independent as Nepal has been; but, if it has no foreign relations, it does not count in the comity of nations in the way an independent country does. I pointed out that during the last hundred years or more, although Nepal was an independent country, she had no foreign relations except through the British in India. That was her only window to the outside world. It is only during the last 20 to 30 years that I believe she has had an Ambassador at the Court of St. James and, still more recently, in America. What I wish to make clear is this: I was not hinting that the British Government in India prevented her from having independent foreign relations but rather that she herself did not think it necessary or desirable or feasible to develop these international contacts.

Much has been said about Nepal in the course of this debate. I do not wish to add anything to what I said yesterday. I think I have made our position clear enough. It is now almost exactly a month since this new situation developed in Nepal and we have dealt with it, I think I may well claim, with a very great deal of patience. We have been criticized by various people on various grounds because of that. Nevertheless, we do not intend to be rushed. What I said yesterday was clear enough indication, not only of how our minds were working but of the steps that we were taking or rather the line that we were adopting in our talks. We propose to adhere to that line and as soon as the time comes to make any precise formal announcement, I shall come to the House and make it.

I have spoken of China and, more particularly, of Tibet. Prof. Ranga seems to have been displeased at my occasional reference to Chinese suzerainty over Tibet. Please note that I used the word suzerainty, not sovereignty. There is a slight difference, though not much. I was telling the House about

a historical fact; I was not discussing the future. It is a historical fact and in the context of things it is perfectly true that we have repeatedly admitted Chinese suzerainty over Tibet just as we have laid stress on Tibet's autonomy. But apart from this historical or legal or constitutional argument or even the argument that Mr Gautam raised about buffer States and the like which, if I may say so, is not much of an argument, though it may be his desire and my desire, the real point to be made is that it is not right for any country to talk about its sovereignty or suzerainty over an area outside its own immediate range. That is to say, since Tibet is not the same as China, it should ultimately be the wishes of the people of Tibet that should prevail and not any legal or constitutional arguments. That, I think, is a valid point. Whether the people of Tibet are strong enough to assert their rights or not, is another matter. Whether we are strong enough or any other country is strong enough to see that this is done is also another matter. But it is a right and proper thing to say and I see no difficulty in saying to the Chinese Government that whether they have suzerainty over Tibet or sovereignty over Tibet, surely, according to any principles, the principles they proclaim and the principles I uphold, the last voice in regard to Tibet should be the voice of the people of Tibet and of nobody else.

Sir, I do not know how you are going to proceed about this Motion. There are a number of amendments. I cannot accept any amendment. I think Mr Anthony's amendment was about our resisting communistic aggression. I just do not understand how that amendment fits in. I am going to resist every type of aggression, regardless of whether it is communist or not.

There is one other matter and I am sorry to take more of the time of the House. Pandit Kunzru criticized very much the attitude that we have taken up in the United Nations. That attitude has been governed by two factors. One is our judging the situation and deciding what would help at the time. The other was our feeling throughout that it was not much good passing resolutions which, generally speaking, were condemnatory and associating ourselves with such

condemnation even though that condemnation might be justified, because that does not help. We wanted to find a way out. Our associating with that particular resolution would perhaps have meant a reduction in our capacity to help. Having condemned, we could not have approached the other party or dealt with it in any way. We could neither have understood their view-point nor could we have placed it before our other colleagues and friendly countries. Had we supported the resolution, we would not have been able to perform such useful function or service as we do now. Apart from this, our general approach in this matter aims at peace and a settlement. If one is aiming at peace and a settlement, one should adopt ways that lead to peace and not those that lead to war. It may be that people do not want war; but one must beware of action that may lead to war. In this particular case, for instance, action has been taken which, it was thought, would not lead to an extension of the fighting area but which has, in fact, led to consequences that the people do not like and did not foresee. Therefore, in regard to those resolutions, we felt that we should not support them because that meant reducing the chances of a settlement by peaceful methods.

THE TEMPER OF PEACE

FRIENDS, it is always a pleasure for me to come to England.

I have many friends here and the memory of my earlier days surrounds me. I welcome, therefore, this opportunity to come here again but the pleasure that this would have brought me has been marred somewhat by the crisis which confronts the world and the burdens which each one of us has to bear. This makes me somewhat hesitant to talk to you. It would serve little purpose for me to repeat platitudes. To refer frankly to the matters of grave import which oppress us today is not easy for me in my present position. It would ill become me to say anything which embarrasses friends here and yet this very consciousness of pervasive friendliness in

England emboldens me to talk to you as to friends who have a common purpose in view and who wish to co-operate in achieving it.

What is that purpose? Surely, today, it is the avoidance of war and the maintenance of peace. Of my generation many have lived the greater part of their lives and only a few years remain for us. It matters little what happens to our generation but it does matter a great deal what happens to hundreds of millions of others and to the world at large. Today, these hundreds of millions all over the world live under some kind of suspended sentence of death and from day to day an atmosphere is created in people's minds of the inevitability of war. Helplessly we seem to be driven towards the abyss. More and more people in responsible positions talk in terms of passion, revenge and retaliation. They talk of security and behave in a way which is likely to put an end to all security. They talk of peace, and think and act in terms of war.

Are we so helpless that we cannot stop this drift towards catastrophe? I am sure that we can, because vast masses of people in every country want peace. Why, then, should they be driven by forces apparently beyond their control in a contrary direction? Politicians and statesmen strive for peace through the technique of politics which consists in devising carefully worded formulae. During the last ten days, the Commonwealth Prime Ministers have wrestled with this problem of world peace. All of us earnestly seek peace. I hope that our labours will help in producing the desired result. But something more is necessary than mere formulae. What we need is a passion for peace and for civilized behaviour in international affairs. It is the temper of peace and not the temper of war that we want, even though peace is sometimes casually mentioned.

It is to this temper of peace that I want especially to direct my mind and your mind. We are in the midst of an international crisis and, perhaps, even a greater crisis that confronts us today is the crisis in the spirit of man. We have built up a great civilization and its achievements are remarkable. It holds the promise of even greater achievements

in the future. But while these material achievements are very great, somehow we appear to be slipping away from the very essence of civilization. Ultimately, culture and civilization rest in the mind and behaviour of man and not in the material evidence of it that we see around us. In times of war the civilizing process stops and we go back to some barbarous phase of the human mind. Are we speeding back to this barbarism of the mind?

If we desire peace, we must develop the temper of peace and try to win even those who may be suspicious of us or who think they are against us. We have to try to understand others just as we expect them to understand us. We cannot seek peace in the language of war or of threats. You will all remember the magnificent example of which both England and India have reason to be proud. Both of us, in spite of long continued conflict, approached our problems with this basic temper of peace and we not only resolved them but produced, at the same time, abiding understanding and friendship. That is a great example which we might well bear in mind whenever any other crisis in the relations of nations confronts us. This is the only civilized approach to problems and leaves no ill will or bitterness behind.

I am not a pacifist. Unhappily, the world of today finds that it cannot do without force. We have to protect ourselves and to prepare ourselves for every contingency. We have to meet aggression and evils of other kind. To surrender to evil is always bad. But in resisting evil, we must not allow ourselves to be swept away by our own passions and fears and act in a manner which is itself evil. Even in resisting evil and aggression, we have always to maintain the temper of peace and hold out the hand of friendship to those who, through fear or for other reasons, may be opposed to us. That is the lesson that our great leader Mahatma Gandhi taught us and, imperfect as we are, we draw inspiration from that great teaching.

In Asia, as you know, great changes have taken place. I fear that most of us and, perhaps, more particularly you of the West do not realize the vastness of these changes. We are living through a great historic process which has created a

ferment in the minds of hundreds of millions of people and which can be seen at work in political and economic changes. Asia has a very long history behind it and for long ages it has played an outstanding part in the world. During the last two or three hundred years it suffered an eclipse. Now it is emerging from its colonial status. Inevitably, this is making a great difference to the balance of forces in the world. The old equilibrium has been upset and can never be restored. That is a basic fact to remember. Asia is essentially peaceful but it is also proud and sensitive and very conscious of its newly-won freedom. In its exuberance it may go wrong occasionally. It has mighty problems of its own and wishes to live at peace with the rest of the world but it is no longer prepared to tolerate any domination or threat of domination or any behaviour after the old pattern of colonialism. It demands recognition of its new position in the world. Therefore, I would like you to view with understanding and sympathy these historic changes which are taking place in Asia, for it is of the utmost importance that Europe and Asia should understand each other. Nor should we forget the millions of people who are still under colonial domination in Africa and elsewhere. Outworn formulae of a past age will not help. A new approach and understanding are needed and if these are forthcoming, I feel sure that Asia will respond with all friendship. The countries of Asia need and seek friendship and co-operation, for they have tremendous problems to solve. These problems are concerned with the primary needs of their peoples—food, clothing, housing and the other necessities of life. They are too busy with these problems to desire to be entangled in international conflicts. But they are being dragged into them against their will.

Great nations have arisen in Asia with long memories of the past they have lived through and with their eyes fixed on a future of promise. India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon and Indonesia have recently acquired their freedom. China has taken a new shape and a new form. But whether we like that shape and form or not, we have to recognize that a great nation has been reborn and is conscious of her new strength. China, in her new-found strength, has acted some-

times in a manner which I deeply regret. But we have to remember the background of China,—as of other Asian countries, the long period of struggle and frustration, the insolent treatment that they received from imperialist powers and the latter's refusal to deal with them on terms of equality. It is neither right nor practical to ignore the feelings of hundreds of millions of people. It is no longer safe to do so. We, in India, have had two thousand years of friendship with China. We have differences of opinion and even small conflicts but when we hark back to that long past something of the wisdom of that past also helps us to understand each other. And so, we endeavour to maintain friendly relations with this great neighbour of ours, for the peace of Asia depends upon these relations.

The immediate problem of today is the problem of the Far East. If that is not solved satisfactorily, trouble will spread to Europe and to the rest of the world. And, perhaps, Europe, with her magnificent record of progress, not only in material achievements but also in the culture of the mind and spirit, will suffer most if war comes. Therefore, we must come to grips with this Far Eastern problem with the firm determination to solve it. We can only do so with the temper and approach of peace and friendship and not by threats. The time when threats were effective is long past. No question of saving face or prestige should come in the way of this human and civilized approach to the problems of our age.

Our task is the preservation of peace and, indeed, of our civilization. To this task let us bend our energies and find fellowship and strength in each other.

A GREAT CHALLENGE

FRIENDS and comrades, as you know, I have just come back from Europe after spending nearly three weeks in London, Paris and other places. It was difficult for me to leave India

where so many problems demanded attention. Nevertheless, I am glad I went and I think my visit has perhaps done some good. I was in Europe at a critical time when the issues of war and peace hung in the balance. I endeavoured to throw the whole weight of our country on the side of peace and a negotiated settlement of the conflict in the Far East.

On my return, I have had both good news and bad. The first news that I received filled me with sorrow. This was about the death of that grand old man, Thakkar Bapa, than whom no one has been more devoted to the cause of our backward and under-privileged brothers and sisters especially the tribal folk.

Another piece of news related to the settlement in Nepal. It is easy to criticize this as it is to criticize any step; but I am convinced that it was a statesmanlike act, on the part of all concerned, to come to this agreement. It marks the beginning of a new era in the history of our sister country. There will be many difficulties ahead and a multitude of problems, but if the people of Nepal and their representatives seek the good of their country with a singleness of purpose and co-operate with one another in this great task, I am sure that success will come to them. The immediate task for the proposed interim Government is to take charge of the administration of the country and to establish peace and order. Nepal is independent and we value her independence. But she is also in close touch with India and, therefore, we have especially welcomed the big step towards democracy that is about to be taken.

Perhaps, our biggest problem at present is that of food or rather the scarcity of it. There is naturally much apprehension and some suffering because of this. As you know, we have tried our utmost to secure food from abroad and we hope that our efforts will succeed. Meanwhile, we have to share such food as we have and this involves a tightening of the belt for all of us. Let each person also remember that he should not have more than his share, for this can only result in others having less than their share.

I am speaking to you almost on the eve of the first anniversary of the establishment of our Republic. We have passed

through a difficult year, both nationally and internationally and our difficulties continue. It has been a year of some achievements, of many disasters and sorrows and of continued international tension. We are not the only country which has had to face these heavy burdens. The world is sick today and no country and no sensitive person can be healthy when we see this sorrow and sickness all around. We have no magic remedies for the world's ills or our own. The only remedy is to try to understand the disease. The crisis of the world demands that we forget our petty differences and stand shoulder to shoulder in the service of our country and of humanity. Within a few days, the All-India Congress Committee will be meeting in Ahmedabad and a special duty devolves on those soldiers of freedom who will meet again in the city that was hallowed by the presence of Gandhiji. Let us meet there, as elsewhere, in the spirit of reverent service, with the desire to sink our differences and co-operate in the great tasks that have fallen to us.

Although our internal problems are great and complex, they are, for the moment, overshadowed by the crisis in international affairs, because the future of our country, as that of every country, depends on how we deal with this crisis and on its outcome. If we cannot solve it peacefully and the world drifts towards war, then, indeed, our generation will have failed miserably and it will have to pay a very heavy price for that failure. There is no half-way house for us; we can either work whole-heartedly and with all the strength we have to avert the awful calamity of a world war or we must allow the world to sink into an abyss. Let no man think that any good to him or to his country will come of a war. A war will convulse the whole world, bringing not only infinite destruction in its train but also corrupting the souls of those who survive. We are thus facing a great challenge to our civilization and to such culture as we may possess. How are we going to answer this challenge?

As I speak to you, sharp debates are going on at Lake Success on this very issue and earnest men are arguing with one another about what should be done. I have no doubt that all of them, as well as the countries they represent,

desire to avoid war, for, knowing what it means no person can seek it deliberately. And yet, in the passion of the moment, many things are said and done which may lead to the war we all seek to avoid. We have, therefore, to be clear in our minds and firm in our purpose. We must not be swept away by any gusts of passion or prejudice, for great tasks rest on us and more especially on those who occupy positions of responsibility.

The most urgent problem today is that of the Far East. A brutal war has raged in Korea for many months and innumerable innocent lives have been sacrificed. I think it is true that there was aggression there but it is also true that of the parties concerned none is wholly free from blame. For the past year or more, we persistently urged that the new China should be given a place in the counsels of the world at Lake Success. Yet this was not done and most people realize now that the fate of the world might well have been different had that obvious fact been recognized. There has been reluctance to accept the great changes that have come over Asia. There is still an attempt sometimes to treat the great nations of Asia in the old way. But the major fact of the age is the emergence of a new Asia. This has naturally upset the old equilibrium and balance of power but the change must be recognized, if we are to deal realistically with the world of today. Because the United Nations did not recognize it, difficulties arose that still continue to trouble us.

There was, as you know, the question of crossing the 38th Parallel in Korea. Adequate notice and warning was given but it was not heeded and further complications ensued. Can we not say now, wiser after the event, that this was a major error, which should have been avoided?

It serves little purpose to go back to past history except to learn from it. We have to deal with the present and the future but it sometimes appears that we have failed to learn any lessons from the past. A proposal has been made in the United Nations to name China an aggressor and, quite possibly, it is being discussed today. This proposal cannot lead to peace. It can only lead to an intensification of the conflict and might, perhaps, close the door to further negotia-

tions. It is a tremendous responsibility for any person to take such a step. At no time should this door be closed, for if we close it, we also close the door to a civilized approach to any problem.

I have been intimately concerned with recent developments and I have closely followed them. I am convinced that there is an overwhelming desire for peace all over the world, both in the East and the West. My visit to Western countries has convinced me of this. The information I have received from our Ambassador in Peking has also convinced me that the People's Government of China is eager to have negotiations for a settlement of the Korean dispute and of the other problems in the Far East. Their reply to the resolutions of the Political Committee of the United Nations, embodying certain principles, was considered by some people as a rejection of those principles. After the closest scrutiny, I was totally unable to understand this criticism.

Their reply was a partial acceptance of those principles and certain further suggestions were made which were obviously meant to be discussed. Subsequent to this, further clarification has come from the Chinese Government and this has made it even more clear that they are desirous of negotiations for peace in the Far East. It is easy to argue about words and phrases and such arguments can continue indefinitely. But the occasion demands the highest statesmanship and an approach to these vital problems in a temper of peace and friendliness. It is obvious to me that enough has been said on both sides to make it clear that negotiations in conference will be the next fruitful step. The time has come, therefore, when the representatives of the Powers concerned should meet and discuss these problems instead of talking at each other across thousands of miles.

If the problem of the Far East is tackled with success it will by itself remove the great tension that exists in the world; and it will then be easier to tackle the other problems of Asia and Europe. We have thus the great opportunity of turning the tide of events away from war and in the direction of enduring peace.

I would appeal to the great nations of the West, who are

the repositories of a magnificent culture that we admire and whose astonishing scientific and technical achievements have opened a new era for mankind, not to lose this opportunity in their search for peace. To the nations of Asia, I can speak, perhaps, in even more intimate language and express the fervent hope that they will stand by the methods of peace, whatever happens.

WE WILL NOT COMPROMISE

THOSE hon. Members who have spoken during this debate
 THOSE hon. Members who have spoken during this debate
 ces to our foreign policy that there is really very little that I
 need to say in defence of it. As far as I have been able to make
 out, there is a great deal of agreement in this House on the
 objectives and trends of our foreign policy and I must express
 my gratitude to the House for its kind reception to our views.

It is not an easy matter to speak on a subject which is as wide as the world before us and which involves so many varied and difficult problems. I confess that, although I have given a great deal of attention to these matters over a period of years and am constantly in touch with developments as they occur, I have not yet been able to grasp this sorry scheme of things in the world today, in its entirety. I try to do so as much as I can and take counsel with my colleagues and advisers but, of necessity, the world becomes more and more complicated and with it our foreign policy.

An hon. Member, speaking this morning, quoted a dictum of Bismarck in support of his conclusion that we should consider our frontiers to be somewhere in East Africa, Malaya, Burma and various other distant places. The hon. Member's observation and his quotation from Bismarck for a moment transported me to another century. And I am sure that the hon. Member himself spends his time mostly in

Speech during debate on Foreign Affairs in Parliament, New Delhi, March, 28, 1951

another century. I am sure he will find out sooner or later that not only has Bismarck been long dead but his policies are still more dead. And if any country were to emulate his policy, it is bound to fail. If we begin to think in terms of our frontiers extending thousands of miles away from India then others will think of their frontiers as existing in India and immediately clashes are bound to occur. The fact of the matter is that this nineteenth century outlook which the hon. Member represents in this House, was the outlook of a few imperialist and expansionist European Powers who were trying to spread over the world, in Africa, in Asia and elsewhere, sometimes coming into conflict with the peoples of these continents and at others going to war with one another while trying to grab the world and divide it up among themselves. There is no part of the world now left for any imperialist Power to seize. That may not, of course, prevent them from trying to do so and they may conceivably take possession of some territory here and there for some time. There is no doubt that there still exist people with expansionist ambitions.

So, let us forget the nineteenth century and think of this critical, rather tragic period in the twentieth century instead in which we live. Let us not imagine that foreign policy is like a game of chess played by superior statesmen sitting in their chancelleries. It is much more complicated than that, for it is governed by the aspirations of hundreds of millions of people whose economic needs and objectives are motivated by a variety of causes. It is governed by the threat of war, a war on an unimaginable scale which has been made possible by tremendous technological developments. Foreign policy is, thus, no more a matter, as in the olden days, of siding with one Power against another in return for some territorial possession or advantage. We cannot deal with this international situation without understanding the basic causes underlying it, except by evaluating these in terms of the objectives that inspire our own activities and shape our policies.

When people talk of alignment of nations, they oversimplify the related issues. I can understand alignments in

times of war; they are probably inevitable. But I fail to understand why this war-time psychology of alignment should be imported into times of relative peace and why any country should be persuaded to line up with one group or another.

My statement holds good irrespective of the policies or objectives of such rival groups. Under such circumstances our policy would be simple without, at the same time, being either passive or negative—we would do our utmost to avoid a world war or any war for that matter, we shall judge all issues on their merits and act in conformity with our objective. By aligning ourselves with only one Power, you surrender your opinion, give up the policy you would normally pursue because somebody else wants you to pursue another policy. I do not think that it would be a right policy for us to adopt. If we did align ourselves we would only fall between two stools. We will neither be following the policy based on our ideals inherited from our past or the one indicated by our present nor will we be able easily to adapt ourselves to the new policy consequent on such alignment. Our present policy flows from what we have thought and said in the past, while incidentally it also helps in the maintenance of peace and the avoidance of war in the world today.

During the debate, repeated references were made to external publicity. I shall frankly confess that I am not satisfied with our external publicity. I am not satisfied with it for a variety of reasons, the first among them being that it is inadequate due to financial reasons. Secondly, the personnel in charge of it is not quite as well trained or as satisfactory as we should like it to be. The hon. Members who spoke on this subject said that they wanted persons in charge of our external publicity to be well versed in India's history, culture etc. I agree with them and we certainly would like to have such people. The hon. Members also suggested that they should be trained journalists. In addition to these, of course, there are obviously other specific qualities required of those engaged in external publicity. An officer may prove to be a great success in the United States of America but may turn out to be a complete failure, say, in China or in a European

country. There are certain special qualities and knowledge that may be required of the personnel depending on the country to which they are likely to be posted. The selection of personnel for external publicity is thus as difficult as the selection of diplomatic personnel.

Apart from this, I should like the House to consider whether our external publicity should be done in the same way as in the U.S.A. or the United Kingdom. They are great countries with ample resources; the money they spend on publicity abroad is enormous and far beyond our means. Speaking for myself, even if I had all that money, I would not spend it in the same way. I would much rather make use of it for the development of our country. We cannot compete with them and we do not want to compete with them. Our ways are different and our background is different.

While the quality of our publicity admittedly depends on the ability of our representatives, what we say about our achievements ultimately depends on the achievements themselves. And what is the test of the efficacy of our external publicity or even of our foreign policy? The ultimate test is whether our country rises in status in the councils of the world or not. It is certainly true that the policies of our Government come up for criticism in other countries, especially those which do not approve of our policies. Yet, the status of India in the world is much greater today than ever before. I do not wish to dwell upon this point further, for ultimately what we really are matters more than what other people think of us.

Very often, on specific issues, the bulk of opinion may be against us in a particular country. Under these circumstances, it will be unfair to expect our representative abroad to be able to influence a whole country merely through pamphlets and talks. He can only outline our general policies and bring them to the notice of the public in that country. He cannot convince people of our policies against their will. We cannot hold him responsible if our policies do not find favour with the public in a foreign country. It is we here who are responsible for evolving policies. Unfortunately, today, there is a great deal of adverse criticism in some countries against

our policy and sometimes it takes rather a personal form, too. Well, I do not think we should mind this over much.

Some hon. Members have made the extraordinary suggestion that we issue an ultimatum to the foreign powers who have possessions in India; they advocate what they call a 'strong line.' One does not go about, in this complicated world, issuing ultimatums, unless one follows the policies of Bismarck which the hon. Member referred to, unless one had the strength of Bismarck behind one. Let me make clear our policy in regard to foreign possessions in India. India cannot tolerate any footholds of foreign powers in this country. We are anxious to give the people in these areas an opportunity to live their own life and the right to choose their future. We do not wish to interfere with their ways of life. There are only two ways of bringing this about—either through war or through diplomatic means. In pursuance of our ideals, we have ruled out war as a means of redress, unless we are forced into one. The only alternative we are left with is the diplomatic method and we are pursuing it.

In the world as it is today, it is impossible to force the pace of events or act decisively and firmly in such matters as this without endangering the peace not only in the region concerned but in the world as a whole. Our attitude to foreign possessions in India has, of necessity, been cautious and our progress in securing results necessarily slow. In so far as a peaceful solution avoids entanglements, it may even prove to be the swiftest of solutions.

The House is no doubt aware that foreign ministers of certain important countries are meeting in Europe and proceeding very slowly only to draw up an agenda. If these matters are discussed round a conference table, there is always hope of some solution being found. It may not prove to be a lasting solution but, at any rate, it will serve to avert war. We venture to suggest that the same method be employed in the Far East and that the Powers concerned should gather round a conference table. At one time, it almost seemed as if this were possible but unfortunately it did not take place; events took a different turn and the United Nations passed a resolution which, temporarily at least, came in the way

of a negotiated settlement. Meanwhile, the war is going on in Korea and, whatever the result of this war, it is eventually the people of Korea, I suppose, who will suffer most. It is a sad commentary on our times that, whether one country sets out to enslave another or whether it seeks to liberate it, the consequences are exactly the same. In either case, it is death and misery for millions. I should imagine that the situation in Korea, from the point of view of the United Nations, has improved somewhat during the last few months but I doubt if that has made any difference. I am no expert on military affairs and I can say nothing more. Summing up my view of the recent developments, however, I would say, guardedly and negatively, that the last two or three months have not brought war any nearer. On the whole, the tension in the world has relented and the danger of a world war has, if anything, receded. I do not say that it has disappeared altogether. On balance, we have gained something and I feel that this gain should be consolidated. I must remark, in conclusion, that the United Nations was meant to be an institution for the preservation of peace and was organized as such. Paradoxically enough, it is now engaged in meeting aggression with armed force.

Another curious feature of the situation in Korea is becoming increasingly evident. A new development is taking place, a rather remarkable and a disconcerting one. Generals in the Far East have started making statements of far-reaching political significance. It seems to me that this development is fraught with grave consequences for all the countries concerned. A particular general may be a great soldier or commander but that does not entitle him to make excursions into the realm of politics. During the last few hundred years, in democratic as well as non-democratic countries, it has been customary for the civil government of the day to lay down policies and for the commanders in the field to carry them out. Before policies are formulated, the views of the commander on the military situation are ascertained but policies are laid down by the governments. As far as India is concerned, I can say that no commander in India is going to lay down any policy at any time; it is the

Government of India that will do that.

One hon. Member wanted to know if it was true that India House did not submit any accounts or papers to the Ministry in Delhi and that there was a kind of imperium in imperio. This certainly was news to me but, in order to avoid a mistake, I referred the matter to my Ministry and was told that this statement of the hon. Member was very, very far from being correct. Let me read out the note received from my Ministry.

"Not only are all the accounts of the High Commissioner's office audited by the Auditor of the Home Accounts in London but the final consolidated figures of expenditure are sent by the auditor to the Accountant General of Central Revenues here for incorporation in the accounts of the Central Government. The High Commissioner also sends us full details of his budget estimates. These are scrutinized and approved by the Ministry. This latter procedure came into force from this year."

My friend, the hon. Dr Mookerjee, also referred to India House in rather mysterious terms and suggested that some enquiry be made into its affairs. I am willing, if the need arises, to institute an enquiry but we have to have a specific subject for an enquiry. It is true that India House at present is by far the most expensive of our foreign Missions but then it is not just another embassy. Within its sphere comes a wide range of important and miscellaneous activity. We have inherited some of the duties of the old India Office. It has a very large education department which deals with thousands of Indian students; there also exists another large section to represent our Army, Navy and Air Force as well as a supply department and a large medical section besides. But one must remember that the diplomatic functions are far heavier in London than in any other Mission abroad. Besides, London still continues to be a very highly important international centre for economic and political reasons. It is not, therefore, at all helpful if an hon. Member feels vaguely that something is wrong. I can certainly have any particular complaint looked into when it is brought to our notice.

The House is no doubt aware that, among the foreign countries we have to deal with, Pakistan is the most important. This is so for a variety of reasons. Apart from being our next-door neighbour, Pakistan shares her history and culture with us. Also, the problems in which we are mutually involved have, in a manner of speaking, brought us closer to each other. A large number of people in Pakistan have their friends and relatives here; similarly, people in India have friends and relatives in Pakistan. When people come over from the other side and meet their old friends, they embrace one another; they forget, for a moment, the new barriers that have sprung up between them and talk of old times with nostalgia. In spite of all that has happened, the two countries are intimately connected. As against all this, it is also true that grave problems have arisen, during the last three and a half years, in our relations. These problems were inevitable consequences of Partition but what happened after it has made the situation considerably worse. All these years, we have been struggling to restore normal relations and although we have made some progress in this direction, they would certainly admit of improvement. Any problem bearing on our relations with Pakistan, whether it relates to East Bengal or the canal waters in the Punjab, has to be viewed not in isolation but as a part of Indo-Pakistan relations as a whole. Unfortunately, there is a great deal of fear and suspicion that vitiates our relations. Speaking on this subject Dr Syama Prasad Mookerjee expressed the opinion that our attitude to Pakistan was contradictory. On the one hand, we talk of coming to terms with Pakistan and have entered into a trade pact with her which, he said, would only help Pakistan to become stronger in relation to us. On the other hand, he pointed out, we have taken a firm stand on Kashmir. It is true that we do both because both are necessary. Obviously, we cannot overlook any obstacles to better relations between the two countries if they exist. Nor can we go to war because the Kashmir issue remains unsolved. Though our attitude is logical in a theoretical sense, it postulates two antithetical courses of action. Our policy is, nevertheless, an integral whole. Let me sum it up for you.

We are convinced that India and Pakistan must, as quickly as possible, revert to normality in their relations. The two countries are so situated that it is imperative that the relations between the two should be the most cordial. Being neighbours, they have a certain identity of economic interests. It is only when they promote their trade relations arising from their economic interdependence that their relations can return to normality. In the meanwhile, we cannot escape from the problems that detract from improved relations between Pakistan and us. We try to overcome them, not to lose hope and give them up as insoluble. Struggling in our search for agreement, we proceed slowly and patiently. Sometimes, we make a little progress and are heartened by it. Only recently we came to a trade agreement with Pakistan. We did not contract this agreement in a fit of generosity for Pakistan. Not that it is bad to be generous. On the contrary, generosity pays in the end provided you are not generous at somebody's expense or at the expense of your own country. I, however, maintain that we were not being generous to Pakistan. It was in the light of an objective appraisal of the situation from which, I assure you, all sentiment was divorced that we decided that a trade pact between the two countries was bound to be mutually beneficial. We stand to profit as much from it as Pakistan. I am afraid that some of us in this House welcome any opportunity to injure the interests of the other party but we should bear in mind the possibility that the harm might recoil on us. The trade pact was thus considered not only an objectively desirable step but also as one which would help in securing some normality in our relations. There are a number of outstanding disputes, such as the ones relating to the canal waters and evacuee property. The House is aware that we have made several attempts to resolve them but I shall not go into them at present.

Mr Bakar Ali Mirza said that he deeply regretted the partition of India. So do all of us. Nevertheless, I think we all realize that, however regrettable Partition was and however grave its consequences, the fact remains that we had agreed to it. Any attempt to go back on it is bound to prove

utterly impractical. And to wish to do so seems to me merely sentimental.

Finally, I should like to say a few words about the Kashmir issue. Normally, I would not have said much about it because the issue is, at the moment, being considered by the Security Council. In fact, I believe it is coming up for discussion tomorrow at Lake Success. I should, however, like to clear a few doubts which exist, not in the minds of hon. Members in the House but in the minds of people outside it. More than one hon. Member have suggested that the issue be withdrawn from the Security Council. This reaction is, perhaps, understandable in the circumstances. In the first place, I am not quite sure if it can be at all withdrawn. Secondly, *this could entail the reorientation of our basic policy towards the United Nations Organization.* This is not a small matter. From the very outset, we have reposed our faith in the UNO, not because we considered it a perfect organization but because we thought it was a step in the right direction, because we felt its objectives were right. The mistakes which it has undoubtedly made cannot, however, disprove the need for such an organization. I have sometimes been distressed by the thought that the UNO has moved away from some of the ideals that led to its creation. Nevertheless, I feel that if the UNO ceased to function today, it would be a disaster for the world. For the world cannot afford to do without some such organization. It would be a wrong thing for any country, in a fit of impatience, to sever its relation with this Body and weaken it in the process. There will then be nothing left to fall back upon in international relations. I believe our attitude to Kashmir has been characterized as sentimental by people abroad. I wonder what our critics would say if they read about Pakistan's approach in their newspapers. I can assure our critics that my colleagues in the Government who formulate our policies are not easily influenced by sentiment. In fact, I have always found their capacity for cold-blooded reasoning remarkable. I should also like to remind the critics that, for months after the raids on Kashmir started, we had the good fortune to have Gandhiji with us. Hardly a day passed when I did not

seek his advice on matters that troubled me. His views on the Kashmir issue are no secrets, because he expressed them at his prayer meetings. By no stretch of imagination could his attitude be described as sentimental. I know his conclusions were arrived at after close reasoning.

The House will remember that, some time ago, a resolution jointly sponsored by the U.S. and U.K. delegations was placed before the Security Council. I must say that it distressed us to read it for it seemed to us so completely wide of the mark. How could they ignore so much of what has happened? How the able representatives of these two great nations could possibly have sponsored a resolution like this is beyond me. At the meeting of the Security Council, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan also spoke at great length and his charges were incredibly fantastic; it was a surprising performance even for him. I have had something to say about all this and I do not wish to repeat myself. The resolution, its approach and the way it has been put forward at this juncture will endanger the peace of the world. This approach is wrong and distorted and grossly unfair to India and the people of Kashmir. Since we did not accept this resolution, we did not suggest any amendments to it.

In the place of this joint resolution, an amended resolution has now been placed before the Security Council by the same sponsors. I agree that, to a certain extent, it is an improvement on the old one but, basically, it still ignores the real situation. It also contains certain recommendations which, as we have all along made clear, we cannot accept. Further, I must express my regret at the tone and content of some of the speeches, in particular the one made by the representative of the United Kingdom. It seems to me that he has displayed an astonishing ignorance of the entire problem.

Even during the period when the resolution was being considered by the Security Council, before it and since then, there has been a continuous and intensive propaganda in Pakistan for *jehad* against India. Any talk of settlement seems to me to be wholly futile in the context of this perpetual threat of *jehad* and, to add to that, the wild charges made against us by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. The

atmosphere has to clear up before any friendly talks are possible. Above all, India desires peace for herself and peace in the world. Let me, however, remind everyone concerned, that India is not quite so weak or helpless that she should submit to insults and the threats of *jehad*.

From the very beginning it has been our declared wish that the people of Kashmir should themselves decide their future. We will continue to adhere to our policy whatever happens. In pursuance of our policy, we agreed to hold a plebiscite provided the conditions necessary for its peaceful conduct were fulfilled. The conditions which we consider necessary for a plebiscite are contained in the resolutions of the Security Council of August 1948 and January 1949. A deliberate attempt is now being made to go back on these and hence the delay in settlement. We made many important concessions when we accepted those resolutions. We could not further compromise on issues which we considered fundamental. The substance of the resolutions of 1948 and 1949 and the directives contained therein we considered vital and still do; we will not compromise on these in order to appease Pakistan or her sympathizers. Nor can we agree to leave Kashmir unprotected or ungoverned. We cannot allow any outside authority, civil or military, to assume charge of its affairs even temporarily.

The resolution now before the Security Council does not flow from the resolution of August 1948. It is a new proposition altogether and the arguments advanced in support of it by the U.K. and U.S. delegations posit an entirely new and fantastic theory that Kashmir is a kind of no-man's land where sovereignty is yet undetermined. Neither the United Nations Commission nor the Security Council have ever advanced such a theory before and, indeed, they could not because the facts were indisputably clear. Kashmir is, juridically and politically, an integral part of India and at no time have the United Nations Commission or the Security Council challenged this fact. The fact that Pakistan is guilty of aggression in Kashmir and that, as a result of this, a certain portion of it has been removed from our factual control cannot and does not detract from our

status and our right in Kashmir. Because of our desire to secure the conditions of peace and to avoid further bloodshed, we accepted the Cease-fire Agreement and chose to allow the existing military position to continue pending further negotiations. This has been interpreted not only to mean that Pakistan has acquired some kind of political right over the territory now under her control but also that she has a right to interfere in the other part of Kashmir. We refuse to accept either of these interpretations. In whatever manner I look at the case I do not see how Pakistan has any rights whatsoever.

The accession of Kashmir to India is entirely in conformity with the Indian Independence Act and the negotiations that preceded it; it is also fully in accord with all that has happened in the case of the other Princely States which acceded to India. Kashmir acceded to India when she was still a Dominion of the Commonwealth and the accession was accepted on behalf of the Crown by the then Governor-General. It is strange that His Majesty's Government should now argue that a Dominion had acted unconstitutionally; they are really blaming themselves.

The Government of India has been a continuing body through the changes in India's constitutional status. When India became a republic some time after power had been transferred to Indian hands, the new Government inherited not only the liabilities and duties of the old Government but also its assets and its rights. After all, we continued to be a member of the United Nations without a fresh election. Similarly, it was as much our right as it was our responsibility to protect not only the States which had acceded to India but also those which had not acceded to Pakistan. Thus, even if Kashmir had not acceded to India, we should have still been obliged to protect the people of Kashmir against aggression. Kashmir has at no time been recognized as a sovereign State under international law. It has always been considered an integral part of India. Partition made no difference to our responsibilities in Kashmir as long as it had not acceded to Pakistan. We did not ask the United Nations to adjudge the validity of Kashmir's accession or to determine where

sovereignty lay. We did not seek arbitration but we went to them to complain about aggression by Pakistan which we thought might jeopardize world peace. Evidently, the sponsors of the joint resolution suffer from a short memory; they have even forgotten how the matter came up before the Security Council and the history of the tragic period that preceded it. The United Nations took advantage of our initiative in our referring the matter to them and thus enlarged the scope of their enquiry. Despite the protests of the Kashmir Government, we accorded every facility to the UN Commission only because we did not want to undermine the prestige of the United Nations. Until now, neither the UN Commission nor the Security Council have suggested that the accession was open to question.

We have always been agreeable to the idea of a peaceful settlement through mediation. We do not consider arbitration the right means of solution for a complex problem like demilitarization. We submit that the proposal for arbitration is not fair because it ignores the basic facts we have mentioned.

A great deal of stress has been laid, in the revised resolution and in the speeches sponsoring it, on the proposal to have a Constituent Assembly for Kashmir. No mention has, however, been made of the continuous threat of war that is hurled at us by Pakistan day after day. We have made it abundantly clear that the proposal to have Constituent Assembly in Kashmir does not, in any way, detract from the authority of the United Nations. It follows naturally and inevitably from our Constitution. We are merely seeking to regularize the position in Kashmir so that the authority for government is derived from the people and not from an absolute sovereign or from a political party.

I want to repeat that Kashmir is an integral part of India and is governed, in so far as the subjects on which Kashmir has acceded to India are concerned, by the Constitution of India. I hope people will realize that we cannot afford to upset or violate our Constitution just because of some resolution that has been placed before the Security Council.

We are always prepared to have the assistance of a

mediator in order to explore the possibilities of a settlement. How far such a mediator would be able, at this juncture, to bring about a solution is a matter for consideration by all those concerned. I have dwelt at length on the legal and historical aspects of this case, not because I believe that the strength of our case is based on barren legal formulas but because I desire to remind the parties to this dispute and those who are interested in its solution that we cannot be expected wilfully to violate our Constitution and our laws which we hold sacred. I have often had to repeat our case because, unfortunately, people in this world begin to lose their perspective when they hear untruth told them repeatedly.

WE DECIDE FOR OURSELVES

SIR, I have listened with attention and respect to the speeches delivered on this Motion. When I was not able to be present I took the trouble to read the reports of the speeches made. Many kind words have been said about the President's Address and about the work of the Government. Many critical things have also been said. The President's Address, coming as it did from that high office notwithstanding, is a statement made on behalf of the Government. It represents in dignified and restrained language the general outlook and policy of the Government.

As the President said in his Address, we have met under rather unusual circumstances. This House is not likely to consider any matter of controversy in the course of this session. We shall carry on because Governments have to carry on whatever happens. Therefore, we must cover the interregnum between this Parliament which is in its last stages and the new one, now in the process of birth. At such moments, one tends to look back at what has been done and at the same time to try and peep through the veil of the future.

It is quite natural that references should have been made to the General Elections. Important as they are, they do not touch the problems before the country. As an hon. Member said, the General Elections have been a tremendous experience for millions of our people. It is easy to criticize some of the things that happened during the elections but I think it is generally recognized here and abroad that this gigantic experiment has been a great success. Although the organization that planned the elections did very good work, it is really the people of India who carried them through and who, therefore, deserve our congratulations. Whatever our personal reactions to the results of the elections or to the way they were conducted, I think we shall be completely justified in saying that they represented the mind of India at the time. It is possible that people gave their votes under some stress or influence or that a desire to express their displeasure or pleasure played some part in the manner of voting. In that case, their view may change later. Nevertheless, the results of the elections were a fair indication of the forces at work in India.

These elections can teach us many lessons and if we are wise we shall learn them and fashion our conduct accordingly.

I do not wish to say much more about the elections. Many of us feel that the election rules laid down by Parliament are capable of improvement and that the improvement, if and when made, will further simplify the election machinery.

Some points brought up by an hon. Member, I think, are worthy of notice and consideration. For instance, it is alleged—I am not personally aware of it—that in some places the ballot boxes could have been opened and tampered with. If it is true, it is a grave matter and needs to be looked into. I entirely agree with the hon. Member that, as far as possible, the counting should be done immediately after the polling with no gap of time in between. I presume nobody will differ with this view. These were our first elections and we did not have enough people with sufficient experience in this matter. I have no doubt that on the next occasion many of these defects will be eliminated.

It was also pointed out that it was not very difficult to remove the symbol from the box. I do not wish to say anything to discredit the election machinery, because these are odd incidents. I know of a case where a clerk was seen removing a label from one box and trying to put in another. He was caught by his officer. If it is done once, it will make no significant difference; but if done oftener it can completely falsify the voting in that box. All this must be enquired into.

I have referred briefly to the elections but what I really wanted to say to this House was about the bigger problems we are facing. Even though this House may not be directly concerned, the country is facing them and many of us will have to deal with them in other capacities. The President referred to foreign affairs and international relations in his Address. I should like to say a few words about them because there has been a great deal of criticism of our foreign policy from some quarters in this country. It is true that the criticism has been on the decline because it is obvious that our foreign policy has justified itself. We are told that we have no friends in the world. That is a strange misreading of current happenings in the rest of the world. I claim that we not only have friends but that we are friendly with every country and, what is more, these countries regard us with a certain respect. It is recognized that we decide for ourselves—sometimes not rightly in the opinion of other countries—and that we try to pursue the policy we consider right without outside interference. I think it would be worth their while, were it possible for hon. Members, to tour all the countries and find out for themselves how India stands in the eyes of the common people of the world.

I feel sure that they will discover that the common people of the world hold India and India's policy in high esteem, even though sometimes they do not like it or agree with it. That is no small achievement for a country just entering the international field. Both internationally and nationally, we have been through stormy weather and we have tried our best to keep on an even keel. Perhaps, we have not been quite as dramatic as people believe we should have been in our conduct of foreign affairs. Our behaviour as an agita-

tional party, however justified in its time, would hardly be suitable in a chancellery, for instance. However, I do not think our policy has changed in any basic sense, although adaptations to changing circumstances have been frequent.

Any official statement on the part of the Government is criticized as being flat and stale. It is said that it has no fire or force in it. The Address of the President of the great Republic of India has got to be dignified and restrained. I hope the Government of India speaks and acts in a dignified and restrained manner. We must look not at the manner but at the content of what is said. The President referred to the upheavals in the Middle East, in North Africa and in Western Asia and talked of our past and present reactions to these happenings. The manner of his address was calm and dignified. This seems to have led some hon. Members and some press men to believe that our Government had abandoned the firm stand it had taken earlier. I would beg the House not to interpret the absence of fire in the President's Address as a sign of change in our policy. At the United Nations, even the most powerful countries have often to whittle down their policies, especially when the issue in question is a complicated one. Let not hon. Members imagine that the Government of India can sit on a high perch and deliver homilies to the world. Of course, hon. Members do not want us to threaten the world with dire consequences if India's behests are not carried out but the policy they advocate amounts to that. That India should take charge of the world is, surely, not only gross presumption on our part but also inconsistent with the way responsible governments function. Although there is so much tension in Asia, Africa and Europe, our relations with their various countries are cordial in a real sense. That is no small achievement. Our relations are friendly with those great countries which on another plane appear to be in conflict with one another. We have the confidence of these countries. We respect their confidence even though we do not always agree with all that they do.

The questions Dr Mookerjee put to the House are certainly difficult but that is no reason why there should not be absolute frankness in answering them. Of course, we

cannot shout about every governmental activity from the house-tops. There are secrets which the Government must keep, especially when other countries are concerned. In regard to Kashmir, some hon. Members have repeatedly said, 'Withdraw this case from the United Nations or the Security Council' or 'If you cannot get it by this means, adopt other methods'. Let us be clear about what this means. How does one withdraw a case? Does one simply send a letter to the United Nations saying, 'We withdraw our case, because we have had enough of you'? That would mean a complete break with the United Nations. Of course, as an independent country, it is open to us to do that and take the consequences. We are at the United Nations by voluntary choice and not merely by the compulsion of events. The Kashmir issue was bound to be put up before the United Nations by some other country even if we had not done so.

We respect the United Nations and are all for a world organization dealing with such matters. It is right that we should remain a member of the United Nations, even though things do not always happen according to our wishes. We have made it perfectly clear that we are not willing to jeopardize the interests of the people of Kashmir or those of our own people. Nobody will be allowed to impose anything dishonourable upon us. We have decided to await the verdict of the Security Council, however long it may be in coming. The way of peace is always the better and, in the long run, the shorter way. The way of war is no way at all, for it solves nothing. When Dr Mookerjee advises me to "adopt other methods", he obviously talks of war. The hon. Member surely cannot believe that by adopting an aggressive method we can solve the problem of Kashmir. His way will solve no problem whatever. All it will do is to get us into enormous difficulties. We will cause injury to other people and also injure ourselves. Everything we have so far stood for will not only receive a shock but probably suffer for a whole generation. The consequences are not a small matter. We have to act and speak in a responsible way when we deal with a difficult situation.

In a military sense, we are weak compared with the great

countries of the world. We have a fine Army, a fine Navy and a small but fine Air Force and I am proud of our defence Services. I have met the young men in our Army, Navy and Air Force and I can tell this House that they are a very fine lot. We have fine human material but we are not essentially a military power. It becomes increasingly clear that even the greatest military powers are tired of war. The interminable truce talks in Korea, for instance, only show that, once these great Powers get entangled in methods of war, they find it very difficult to extricate themselves. There seems to be a realization that armed might affords no adequate solution for the problems of the world. It only leads to further conflict and disaster. Therefore, it is hardly wise for us, who are weak, to talk loosely of "other methods" in regard to Kashmir. At the moment, Kashmir is making remarkable progress, economically, socially and politically. If we were to rush into a war, we would be putting an end to that progress and that would also be a breach of our pledge to the United Nations. No country likes to be accused before the world of breaking pledges.

An hon. Member referred to the recent agitation in Jammu and expressed the opinion that the views of the people of Jammu should be respected. Their views should certainly be respected. But their demand for a closer union with India means a complete break-up of Kashmir. The principle by which we have stood in regard to Kashmir is that the people of Jammu and Kashmir would decide their future themselves. We shall not allow any power to decide it by coercion or war. If the people of Kashmir as a whole are going to decide it, it is necessary to give them an opportunity to do so. If a small group in Kashmir wants to coerce others to decide it according to their wishes, it is open to them to give expression to their wishes in the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir.

I know a little about the internal conditions in the provinces of Jammu and Kashmir. I know of no movement in India that is so thoroughly misconceived and mischievous as the one mentioned by the hon. Member. The Praja Parishad movement in Jammu is completely opposed to the interests of Kashmir and Jammu and of India and contradicts

everything we stand for. It amazes me that people apparently desirous of union with India should work in a way so as to injure India, injure Kashmir and to give help to and encourage the enemies of India. There must either be something wrong with their thinking or they do not mean what they say.

Since the Kashmir trouble began four years ago, many changes have taken place in India. They have been due partly to migrations of population and partly to other developments. These changes have further complicated the Kashmir issue. My personal desire is that there should be a plebiscite in Kashmir provided proper conditions exist for it. I further think that the Constituent Assembly is entitled to decide what course should be followed. The elections have shown which way the trend is. Naturally, this does not apply to the part of Kashmir State which is still in the hands of Pakistan. If the Constituent Assembly comes up against difficulties in coming to a decision, a plebiscite should be held as early as possible. I have no doubt about what the decision of the people will be. I only want to put an end to all conflicts in a peaceful way so that no bitterness is left behind.

When the Security Council passed the resolution, according to which Dr Graham was appointed mediator, we made it perfectly clear that we neither accepted that resolution nor were bound by it on the ground that it contained clauses of which we totally disapproved. We did not, however, object to everything that the resolution contained. We repeatedly said that we did not have the slightest objection to Dr Graham's coming to India as a mediator and that we would gladly treat him as such. We added, however, that we were not prepared to discuss or act up to the resolution of the Security Council. We have been consistent in this matter. When Dr Graham came here, he did not refer to the Security Council's resolution even once. As far as he was concerned, it did not exist. He discussed the various aspects of the Kashmir issue in the capacity of a mediator and made suggestions; we agreed with some, pointed out our objections to others and there the matter ended. He went back and presented a factual report on Kashmir. Then there were

further developments and we sent our representatives. In the course of the discussions that followed, the military advisers of Dr Graham showed our military advisers a certain plan which later came to be known as the Dever's Plan. The plan represented some kind of an intermediate stage. There was much in it to which we had no objection. We were prepared to discuss it and to suggest improvements. Dr Graham himself did not press the plan forward and there was no further discussion. Long afterwards, a paper was published by the UN Secretariat containing a much more detailed version of the Dever's Plan than we were acquainted with. Naturally, we referred this matter to our representatives at the United Nations. They knew nothing about it and so we asked our representative, Sri B. N. Rau, who happened to be in Delhi at the time. He had seen only that part of it which was originally shown to our representatives. That was published by UNO as an appendix to Dr Graham's Second Report to the Security Council and is there for any one to see. When our Military Adviser, General Thimayya, said that he also had never seen the later version of the Dever's Plan, it became clear to us that the addendum had not been shown to us. Dr Graham, not being a direct party to these talks, did not know much about it and might have made a mistake. Anyhow, this is what happened.

The Security Council has again allotted a definite period of time to Dr Graham in which he is to continue his talks and attempt to find a solution. In accordance with our policy of welcoming any further attempts at a peaceful settlement, we have no objection to Dr Graham's coming. It is understandable that hon. Members of this House should be irritated at the prolongation of this business. It must be as annoying to them as the continuance of the Portuguese and French possessions in India, which are irritating little footholds constantly coming in our way. Anyway, our policy in their case has likewise been one of patience and of peace. Why should we create trouble for ourselves by trying to expedite their inevitable withdrawal by other methods?

I should really have liked to draw the attention of this House to some aspects of constructive activity in the country.

I feel that not enough attention is paid to them. When something of this kind happens in other countries, the gigantic machinery of propaganda is set in motion. Everybody talks of the progress the country is making. In our country, even though the building is on a much larger scale than in other countries, our own constructive work comes up for discussion only when some criticism is made about the amount of money spent on it. Of course, it is perfectly right that this House should carefully keep a check on expenditure but I should also like this House to realize that India is showing magnificent enterprise. We are going ahead with our great river valley schemes and building industries, such as the great Sindri fertilizer factory.

I want to call the attention of the House to the tremendous difficulties and strains under which the building of a new India is taking place. Consider the Chittaranjan Locomotive Works which has expanded greatly and is producing locomotives. Take the Hindustan aircraft factory and so many other things. We have built magnificent national laboratories which are producing very fine results besides laying the foundations of our future progress. It is a long list but I would like to acquaint the House and the country with it. Somehow, our minds seem to concentrate only on negative aspects. We should certainly be critical but we must also acknowledge our achievements.

It is said that comparisons are bad—and certainly as Foreign Minister I do not like to compare my country with another country—but it would be interesting, were we to compare the past three or four years in this country with a similar period in the other countries of Asia as well as Europe and America. Consider the circumstances in which we have functioned. There was the aftermath of independence, the partition and large migrations. Considering all this, what we have achieved in our foreign policy, our domestic policy and in laying the foundations of a new political structure stands comparison with any other country. I do not mean to say that we are superior to other countries. That kind of vainglorious approach is wrong. If only we can meet corruption and black-marketing with the severest measures possible,

you will find that we have done rather well; in fact, much better than most countries. I think you will come to the conclusion that we as a parliament, we as a government, we as a people can hold up our heads high before the world.

THE LARGER SCHEME OF THINGS

SINCE yesterday we have been discussing our foreign policy and many aspects of it have been mentioned. We have discussed the Foreign Service, the virtues and failings of our diplomatic personnel, the money we spend and the waste we indulge in or avoid. We have discussed other matters, too.

. As I listened to the speeches that were made today, I became aware of the whole tormented world. When we talk about foreign policy, after all, it is the world or bits of the world that we talk about. It seems to me that the world has hung on the edge of a catastrophe for years. People talk of the success of our foreign policy. How they measure success and how they wish to achieve success in Ceylon or Goa, I do not know. People have said that the policy of our Government has not yielded success, that it has driven us into this or that camp and that the problems in Kashmir and elsewhere still remain unsolved. There has been criticism of our policy but I have waited in vain these two days for one concrete and positive suggestion about what can be done in addition to what is already being done.

Brave words? yes; forensic eloquence? yes; melodrama? yes; but no constructive suggestion! In the world today, there are problems wherever you go, be it Korea, Iran, Egypt, Tunisia, America or Germany. And every problem is an unsolved one, because every problem has to do with the entire world situation in all its complexity. The world situation may, of course, take a turn for the better sometimes but as a whole it presents a very tragic aspect. I do not claim that our policy has always been successful but I wish this

Speech in reply to debate on Foreign Affairs in the House of the People, New Delhi, June 12, 1952

House would realize that the present issue concerns some of the most tremendous problems of the age and is not merely a matter for debate or eloquence. To have to consider and face these problems and to decide what is to be done about them is a tremendous responsibility for any government, individual or parliament. It would be sheer arrogance for us to imagine that India, great as she is, can decide the fate of the world. Of course, not. It may well be, however, that India's help in coming to a decision may make a difference and that difference may come between war and peace. If we can tilt the balance towards peace, it will be a great service to the world.

I approach these problems in all humility. Hon. Members have said that my whims and caprices sometimes fashion our foreign policy. How they refer to me is of no consequence but when they refer to the policy of this great nation as the whim and caprice of an individual, whoever he might be, it is not a small matter. Our policy, as I have repeatedly said, has grown out of our past way of thinking and our declarations and I do claim that, in so far as we could in the changed circumstances, we have stuck to those declarations and ways of thinking. Hon. Members who think otherwise are completely mistaken. Of course, I cannot judge myself but, as far as I can see, we have upheld everything we stood for in the realm of international affairs without the slightest wavering or deviation.

Of course, I may be wrong; others may be better judges but I personally feel sure that it is so. I wish to stand behind everything I have uttered about our remaining in the Commonwealth and those who express doubts about it do not understand what they are saying. It amazes me how some hon. Members of the Opposition with all their eloquence and their fine qualities have lost all ability to understand the changed position. They are like religious fundamentalists who refuse to look right or left and go only in one direction. The whole world may change but their mental habits do not. Whether it is morning, noon or night matters little to them. They continue to repeat the same slogan, no matter what happens.

Of course, we all want peace. The great nations and the various power blocs all talk of peace; and yet peace is considered a dangerous word in some great countries. One's loyalty is doubted if one so much as mentions peace. On the other hand, there are countries where peace is talked of so aggressively and in such deafening tones that it almost sounds like war. After all, peace is a quality, it is a way of approach; it is a way of doing things: it is an objective we want to reach. If you prepare for war while you talk of peace, then surely, there is something wrong with the peace you talk about. We have plenty of peace conferences nowadays but I doubt if anything will come of them. Perhaps, some hon. Members have seen an advertisement in England: 'Join the British Navy and see the world.' We might just as well say: 'Join the peace movement and have free trips all over the world.' There are conferences all the time and people are rushing back and forth, free of charge. I do not know who pays for them. People travel, go to the ends of the earth and suffer extreme discomfort, all for the sake of peace. I do not understand this. I do not think it is dignified for people, whatever their nationality, to rush about at the cost of other countries and people. Surely, you are not going to have peace by merely shouting about peace in the market square, knocking heads and wanting to punish those who differ from you.

Surely, it is necessary for us to function as a mature nation. We are not children; we are not in a debating society where we have to match our forensic skill against one another, regardless of facts and the effect our words are likely to have. It is very easy to talk against imperialism as some hon. Members did. I do not deny that imperialism exists but I would venture to say that imperialism, as it exists today, is hardly what it was in the past. Let hon. Members understand what it is. Let them also understand that there are other imperialisms that are growing. Surely, no one in this House can say that British imperialism, for instance, is the same thing that it was in the past. An hon. Member mentioned Malaya in this connection. British imperialism does flourish in Malaya, in Africa and elsewhere but British imperialism today is an exhausted thing. I hope this House has respect for

the way England has tackled her problems since the war and the courage with which she has faced them. In many places, England certainly does things with which neither I nor this House can agree but that is beside the point. Let us see things in their historical perspective. As far as power is concerned, Britain is no longer what she used to be before the last war. Today, there are, for good or ill, other and greater Powers. I repeat that since the war years I have nurtured considerable respect for England, because I like brave people fighting against odds and the British people have fought against heavy odds. That does not, however, mean that I agree with whatever England says or does.

There are still some colonies that belong to certain Powers. I have no doubt that an end should be put to them all, be they British, French, Dutch, Belgian or any other. The fact, however, remains that today none of the colonial powers have any strength behind them. The colonies perhaps have the strength of tradition and they have been supported by other powers. But, as I said, they have no inherent strength now. Let us by all means put an end to what remains of colonialism in Asia, in Africa and wherever else it exists but let us understand what the real conflict is about. Conflicting forces are marshalling themselves and if they come to grips then the whole world will witness mighty changes and these changes cannot be for the better, because they will cause terrible destruction. It does not help in the slightest to repeat the slogans of yesterday, thinking that they take the place of thought and action. Ours is a complicated, difficult and tormented world. We must not approach our problems with any certitude of success but with a great deal of humility and try to help where we can. Our aim should be to be helpful, to do good, or at any rate, to avoid evil.

It is all very well to talk bravely but melodrama does not become this honourable House. We are the Parliament of India and have to face great problems; we cannot afford to adopt melodramatic attitudes and repeat the slogans of the market place here. We are entrusted with a tremendous responsibility. I beg this House not to consider our foreign policy in terms merely of our own petty success or failure because

the success or failure of any foreign policy today involves the success or failure of the whole world. If and when disaster comes it will affect the world as a whole and, therefore, it hardly matters what your policy or my policy is. Be that as it may, our first effort should be to prevent that disaster from happening. If that proves to be beyond us, we must, at any rate, try to avoid disaster or to retain a position in which we shall be able to minimize, as much as possible, the consequences of disaster, even if it comes.

I want to be perfectly frank with this House. I should like an ever-increasing number of countries in the world to decide that they will not have another war, whatever happens. I should like the countries in Asia—I speak about our neighbours—and other countries also to make it clear to those warring factions and those great countries that are so explosively bitter against each other that they themselves will remain cool and not enter the arena of warfare whatever happens and that they will try at least to restrict the area of conflict, save their own regions and try to save the rest as best they can. I should also like to declare that we are against the use of these horrible modern weapons of war and get other countries to do the same. You have heard of the atom bomb and of the hydrogen bomb which is yet to come. The latter is believed to be far worse than the atom bomb. From the way hon. Members talked about bacteriological warfare I got the impression that they expect this Government to rush in everywhere and express its opinions without taking the trouble to find out exactly what should be said, when it should be said or how much weight should be attached to what is said. I am afraid governments do not function in that way. Governments have to weigh their words and every bit of evidence on which a statement is based. Governments cannot condemn people or nations until they are absolutely convinced that what they say is justified. Governments cannot even say something on the basis of adequate evidence until the proper moment comes. I might add, however, that I think all nations should raise their voices against any form of bacteriological or germ warfare.

Clearly, it is not an easy matter to check this drift towards

catastrophe and disaster. The world is in a ferment of passion and prejudice and I am certain it will do little good to join the crowd of excited people who are shouting at the top of their voices. That will only make things worse. If you are shouting, it does not matter that it is peace you are shouting about. Your job is to try and make people less excited somehow. Your object is not merely to show that you were right or to prove the strength of your convictions but to gain ultimate results. For this, it is necessary to calm people down, to prevent them from fighting and then to set about winning them over. Even though they are in the wrong, you cannot win them over if you tell them that they are bad, very bad and that they should be punished and crushed. I do not mean that we should not condemn what we feel to be wrong but, according to what I have been taught about *civilized* behaviour, it is far better to know our own weaknesses and failings than to point out those of others.

I submit that this is my approach to foreign policy. You may call it neutral or whatever else you like but I, for my part, fail to see how this approach is neutral. Neutrality as a policy has little meaning except in times of war. If you think there is a war on today, we are neutral. If you think there is a cold war today, we are certainly neutral. We are not going to participate in a cold war which, I think, is worse than a shooting war in many ways. A shooting war is, of course, very disastrous but a cold war is worse in the sense that it is more degrading. It does not matter who is right and who is wrong but we shall certainly not join in this exhibition of mutual abuse.

Many subjects have come up for discussion in the course of this debate but there are one or two points I would especially like to put before this House. It has repeatedly been said that we incline more and more towards the Anglo-American bloc. It is perfectly true that during the last few years we have had more economic and other bonds with the United Kingdom and the United States of America than with other countries. That is a situation we have inherited and unless we develop new bonds we shall have to continue as we are doing. We maintained our old ties with these countries

because a nation cannot live in isolation. We wanted certain things that we could not get from elsewhere. In similar circumstances, any country would have acted as we did. That some people obsessed by passion and prejudice disapprove of our relations with the Anglo-American bloc is not sufficient reason for us to break any bond which is of advantage to us.

I cannot deny that there is danger and risk when a country begins to depend upon another. Whatever the form it takes, dependence is always bad and one should be on one's guard against it. Yet a country, placed as India is today, has inevitably to depend on other countries for certain essential things. We are not industrialized enough to produce all that we need. We have to depend on other countries for most of the things our Army or our Air Force or our Navy requires and are, therefore, dependent. However big your army, it is of little use unless you have the necessary equipment. Of course, we must try to build up basic industries so that we can produce things for our essential needs but what are we to do in the meanwhile? We have got to get them from somewhere and we have tried to get them from those countries where our existing economic contacts made it easier for us to do so. It is very difficult for us to build new channels of trade and commerce overnight. We are perfectly prepared to explore these possibilities; for instance, we are perfectly prepared to deal with the Soviet Union or any other country that can supply us with the particular goods we need. But the fact remains that at the moments it is simpler and easier for us to import things from America, England, France and other countries.

I should like to give you the example of our defence Services. They have been built up after a certain model and we have, as it were, inherited them. We may or may not change that model later. It is a satisfactory model as far as it goes, because our defence Services are efficient and our Army is good. It is, of course, organized after the British model. They started it and built it up over a large number of years. Surely, you do not expect us to break it up and start afresh. I can understand the argument that our Army

should come closer to the people. Let us, by all means, consider it and explore the possibilities; but to wish to break up a magnificent fighting unit, simply because it irks us that the British built it, is to my mind extremely childish. We cannot suddenly disrupt our defence Services. What we can do is to make the changes we desire gradually. Now, an army has to have equipment and it is easier for us to continue to get the kind of equipment we have been using, because there are sources which can supply it. If we try to invent an entirely new type of equipment, the arms we are producing in this country now will be rendered useless and that will create all kinds of difficulties.

An hon. Member asked why our advisers are British and not of German or Japanese or some other nationality. Well, things are being done in a particular way and the most important thing is that there should be no breakdown in the organizational machinery of our defence. We cannot have advisers, who think along different lines, who use different equipment and different types of ammunition, coming here and quarrelling amongst themselves while they advise us. We must follow a single system till we decide to change it.

The House will remember that we attained independence through co-operation and friendship. I think history will record that to our credit and, I am not ashamed to say, to England's credit, too. Having achieved our goal we went forward step by step. The House will remember that for the first two years while we were framing our Constitution, we were a Dominion. However, on the very first day our Constituent Assembly met, we declared that our object was to become a republic. That was in the December of 1946. As soon as our Constitution was completed and given effect to, we became the Republic of India. Later, the question of whether or not we should be in the Commonwealth came up. The Republic of India has nothing to do with England constitutionally or legally. Of course, there are the normal bonds that exist between two countries that have had mutual dealings in the economic or cultural sphere. If we decide to remain associated with England or with a particular group of nations, there is no harm, provided no binding factor

or inhibition accompanies that association. Dr Mookerjee, who was himself in the Cabinet when these questions were considered, said that the time had come for us to leave the Commonwealth. I should like him to point out in what way the fact of our being associated with the Commonwealth has affected or diverted our policy during the last three or four years. I do not think our membership of the Commonwealth has affected our policy in the slightest. To insist that it has, therefore, amounts, so far as I am concerned, to acting in a huff. Nations must act with dignity and strength, adopt what they consider the right course and adhere to it. It is open to us to be associated in an alliance with any country. We have avoided alliances which might entangle us. Dr Lanka Sundaram referred to a number of treaties of friendship which we had concluded and to some minor differences in their phraseology. I hope hon. Members will excuse me if I do not go into these trivial points, because they have no importance whatsoever. So far as we are concerned, we are prepared to enter into a treaty of friendship with every country in the world. In an alliance, one invariably takes something and gives something in return. Each country binds itself down to a certain extent and relinquishes its freedom of action to the extent to which it commits itself in the alliance or agreement. An alliance, nevertheless, need not stand in the way of the independence of a country.

Our association with the Commonwealth is remarkable in that it does not bind us down in any way whatsoever and, if I may repeat, it has not done so during the last two or three years either. It has given us certain advantages without our having to accept any liabilities in return. I know that some hon. Members do not like the idea of our being in the Commonwealth. Their dislike is regrettable and I cannot help it, since we are concerned only with the advantages our country gains. Now, Ceylon and South Africa are both members of the Commonwealth and we may well be asked why we put up with what is happening in these countries. If any hon. Members want us to withdraw from the Commonwealth on principle, my answer would be that what they object to is precisely the reason why we should

remain in the Commonwealth. I shall explain what I mean. By doing so, we have better chances of being able to influence the larger policies of the Commonwealth than we otherwise would. Being in the Commonwealth means a meeting once or twice a year and occasional consultations and references. Surely, that is not too great a price to pay for the advantages we get. If the Commonwealth had the right to interfere with any constituent country, then I should certainly cease to be in the Commonwealth. If any hon. Members think that the nations of the Commonwealth have common war or defence policies, allow me to assure them that they are completely mistaken. We have never discussed defence policies in the Commonwealth, either jointly or separately.

Since an hon. Member asked why our Commander-in-Chief should have had to go to London, I shall repeat that our Army is built on the British model. We have a very big department in London for military stores. We have to maintain it because we need the type of things it supplies; we have sometimes to get them through the good offices of the British War Office. Our Commander-in-Chief has, therefore, to go there in order to look into these things. It is not the business of our commanders to discuss policies; that is left to the Ministers. The fact is that we have inherited certain ways from the British. We can decide either to reject them or to accept them. We have rejected many; we have also decided to keep many till we are able to change them if we so desire.

Now, one of the things we have inherited and to the use of which hon. Members opposite have not objected is the English language. There has been no word of protest from the Opposition against the use of the English language and that, if I may say so, is also a sign of the mental subservience about which we are reminded so often. I have no doubt that it is the English language more than anything else that ties us to the Anglo-American bloc and yet I have not heard it cited as a reason for our so-called subservience to the Anglo-American bloc. It brings us nearer to their thoughts, their activities, their books, newspapers, cultural standards and so on, whereas we are cut off from those parts of the world with which we have no linguistic ties. I should like our

country to know the other languages of the world besides developing their own so that we may grow and come in contact with more people of the world. It is strange that some hon. Members should object even to the things that are advantageous to us, simply because they happen to emanate from America or England or some other country in the West, while they accept, without any protest whatsoever, the English language which is our greatest bond with the Anglo-American bloc. I certainly do not have any objection to the use of the English language and am not saying anything against it. My argument is that it is not sensible deliberately to lose a good thing just because we have inherited it from the British. It is true that we have decided ultimately to use our own language in the country and we shall make the change gradually. I hope English will remain even after that, not as an official language but because it is a great language. I hope the other languages of the world will also be introduced in India but the relevant thing at this moment is that, if we adopt an attitude of suspicion towards everything that comes from England or America, it will not help anybody.

We have often expressed ourselves in a way that displeased the great nations and filled them with anger; but we have preferred that to changing our policy. Recent history will testify as to how readily some great nations have shifted their allegiance and how they have had alliances; enemies have come together as allies and then become enemies again. In the last World War, the Soviet Union was allied to Nazi Germany; it was later attacked by Nazi Germany and it fought Hitler's armies with enormous endurance and courage. I am not condemning any country; I am merely pointing out that, at that time, the rulers of the Soviet Union thought it right and desirable to have a close alliance with a country which they had condemned earlier and with which they were to fight to the death later.

I believe all of us are liable to error and I rebel against the notion that an organization or idea or country can be infallible. Such a belief may yield temporary results, but ultimately it is fatal to the growth of a nation; it curbs the mind and spirit and stunts the community. Therefore, it is

folly to judge the present day difficulties of the world with the assumption that a country is either completely right or completely wrong. We must consider each point separately and refrain from the vilification of any country, because it does not help. When the situation demands it, let us by all means point out that a policy is wrong or that something else should be done; but merely slandering other countries will not create the peaceful atmosphere we desire.

I submit again that, so far as our policy is concerned, in spite of the fact that we deal largely with the United Kingdom and the U.S.A.,—we buy our things from them and we have accepted help from them—we have not swerved at all from our policy of non-alignment with any group. We stuck to our policy even though we had to deny ourselves the offered help. That is why other countries realize that we cannot be bought by money. It was then that help came to us and we gladly accepted it; we shall continue to accept help provided there are no strings attached to it and provided our policy is perfectly clear and above board and is not affected by the help we accept. I realize—I frankly admit—that there are always certain risks involved. There may be no apparent risk but our sense of obligation might affect our policy without our knowing it. All I can say is that we should remain wide awake and try to pursue our policy consistently and honestly. If the Government makes a mistake, this House, I am sure, will demand an explanation.

There have been times when one word from us would have brought us many of the good things of life. We preferred not to give that word. Not a few individuals but millions in this country. If at any time help from abroad depends upon a variation, howsoever slight, in our policy, we shall relinquish that help completely and prefer starvation and privation to taking such help; and, I think, the world knows it well enough.

Dr Lanka Sundaram asked whether the Standing Committee of the Ministry of External Affairs was going to be constituted. Well, Standing Committees were constituted in the old British days in a peculiar way and for a special purpose. They serve no useful purpose now. Therefore, I do

not know if one will be appointed. That is a matter for the House to decide. I should like, however, to assure this House and, specially the Opposition, that as Minister for Foreign Affairs I shall welcome consultations with them about any matter pertaining to foreign affairs.

We have associated ourselves with the United Nations. This association does not deprive us of our independence. Of course, it limits our freedom in the sense in which it limits the freedom of every member country. That some limit should be placed on your field of action is the natural consequence of joining an organization of that nature. Our membership of the United Nations is a far greater limitation than our association with the Commonwealth of Nations. In fact, the latter is almost an airy association, because it is not written down on paper or in any constitution or anywhere else; so long as we wish to be there, we can remain there.

To come back to the United Nations, we associated ourselves with the United Nations because we felt that some such world organization was very essential. The League of Nations had failed. The UNO seemed to be a similar attempt under wider and perhaps better auspices and so we joined it. I still think that the Charter of the United Nations is a very fine and noble document. An hon. Member said, "Go and scrap the Charter." I do not understand what he meant. I think the Charter is a very fine thing but it is true that the world is not living up to it. I feel more and more that the United Nations has somehow swerved from the basic provisions of that Charter, in theory as well as in practice. I think that is a very serious matter for us and for other countries.

The Atlantic Pact is between certain Western Atlantic countries. What other countries do for their defence is not my concern. As a government, we do not come into the picture; nor can we object to anything that they do. One thing about the Atlantic Pact, however, has become more and more evident. It began as a pact for defence against aggression but it has apparently widened its scope and taken upon itself the defence of the colonial possessions of the

nations concerned. That, so far as we are concerned, is a very serious matter. It means that certain countries must give assurances, whether formal or informal, that they will protect and maintain colonial rule wherever it exists. We are, as you know, unalterably opposed to colonial rule wherever it exists.

So, I wish to point out to the hon. Members of this House that we have taken as serious a view of this as we did of the Security Council's refusal to discuss the Tunisian question. Apart from the merits of the Tunisian question itself, which should, in any case, be settled, nearly every country in Asia and many countries in Africa are wanting a consideration of the Tunisian issue. This is being denied, because two powerful countries have voted against it. That is a very extraordinary state of affairs. If Asia and Africa together cannot get a subject discussed in the Security Council, because two or three great Powers object to it, then a time may come when the countries of Asia and Africa may feel that they are better off outside than at the United Nations. That would, indeed, be tragic because I do feel that, in spite of its faults, the United Nations serves an essential purpose. If it did not exist today, undoubtedly, all the countries would come together to build up something like it again. I do not want that to happen. I attach the greatest importance to the United Nations but I must repeat that the United Nations has swerved from its original moorings and gradually become a protector of colonialism in an indirect way. This is a dangerous deviation. Instead of looking upon it as a great organization for peace, some of its members have gradually begun to think of it as an organization through which war can be waged. The original idea behind the formation of the United Nations was vastly different and, though the old Charter remains, somehow facts begin to belie it more and more. We have ventured to point this out to the member countries of the United Nations and I think that our words have had some effect.

We are a responsible Government dealing with other Governments and if we shout about our opinions in public the effect of our approach is lost. That is not the way modern

diplomacy is carried on. Because we do not shout, the hon. Members opposite must not think that we are supine.

Hon. Members have referred to the fact that the Union Jack was hoisted over the Parliament building some days ago. Some two or three years ago, this matter was discussed and we decided that as a matter of courtesy, we would allow the Union Jack to be hoisted over one of our important official buildings on a certain day in the year. This decision was not the result of a request but simply a matter of courtesy. At that time, there was no question of flying the flag on Parliament House, since Parliament was not sitting. I must confess that when I saw the flag on Parliament House, I was myself a little surprised because I had expected it to be on the Secretariat building instead. It seems that the instructions given two years ago were not properly understood by the person in charge and hence the mistake. While it is perfectly right for us to show courtesy, I do feel that no flag but the Indian flag should be flown over Parliament House and instructions have been issued to that effect.

I should also like to say one word about the situation in Korea. I am not, at the moment, referring to the truce negotiations which have gone on for such a long time, although they are exceedingly important and one might say that the future, not only of the Far East but of the world, depends on what turn these negotiations take. It is, indeed, a pity that we should be stuck there month after month and year after year. So far as we are concerned, we are not completely out of the picture, because we have tried to keep in touch with the major parties in the dispute. We had special opportunities of doing so. We interested ourselves in this affair in the hope that some way of bringing about peace might, perhaps, be found. I must say, however, that I have been deeply concerned at certain internal developments in South Korea. We have nothing to do with South Korea. We have never recognized the Government of South Korea and it is not our concern. Nevertheless, because we are members of the United Nations and the United Nations is functioning in South Korea, what happens there is a matter of concern to us. The recent developments connected with

the activities of President Syngman Rhee are not only very remarkable but, I think, should make the United Nations and every country connected with it think of the undesirability of any kind of association with a person like President Rhee. To support the regime of President Rhee is to support the very things which the United Nations is supposed to stand against.

DEFINING FOREIGN POLICY

I MUST first of all apologize to this House for not being able to attend this debate in person. We, in the Government, have sometimes to attend to the business of two Houses and when something is before the two Houses simultaneously, it adds to the difficulty. I have tried, with the help of my colleague here, to keep in touch with the trend of the debate and have read reports of some of the speeches made here. Both here and in the other House, it is my business and duty to listen very carefully to the criticism that is made and to the suggestions that are offered. It is my desire to learn from them and to accept them where possible.

The public and sometimes the press have criticized the President's Address as a mere repetition of the policies of the Government. The President is not going to launch a new policy in the country and, therefore, his address is bound to be a repetition of our policy. It gives or purports to give a broad survey of foreign and domestic affairs and does so in language that becomes him as the head of the State.

Every government should have an integrated outlook consistent with its foreign and domestic policy. However, it is not particularly easy to have an integrated outlook because many unknown factors have to be dealt with. We are not in charge of the world and the other countries do not necessarily carry out our dictates or follow our wishes. We have to take



*Returning to Gangtok in Sikkim after a
ride on the India-Tibet road, May 1952*




*Inaugurating the digging of a canal at
Hazratpur in Uttar Pradesh, April 1951*

*Greeting the Nizam at
Hyderabad, September
1952*




*Inspecting works at the
Tungabhadra Dam*





With the Governor of Assam, greeting tribal people at Pasighat in the Abor Hills, October 1952



Receiving a silver plate from Maulana Abul Kalam Azad; the plate engraved with signatures from his Cabinet colleagues was presented to him as a token of their esteem

things as they are and they are, I assure you, in a very difficult state. Vast changes are taking place; the whole world is in turmoil. Some countries are actually engaged in war; the rest live in constant fear of war and suffer the havoc fear brings with it. Enormous technological changes take place from day to day although they do not always come to our notice. The entire economic and social structure of the world is being changed by them. They change the structure of society and the thinking of man. Therefore, it may be that a policy which was good for us yesterday is not good today. A policy which was idealistic and advanced in the 19th century may be out of date today. All of us have been hurled suddenly into the middle of the 20th century, irrespective of whether we wished it or not; but our minds lag behind in the remote past. Even economic and social problems are discussed in terms of the past, although the enormous changes that have taken place as a result of the last two great World Wars are obvious enough. At the end of the last war, we saw two mighty giants rise among the nations—the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Other countries are far behind them in terms of power and technological growth. This situation has upset all the old balances. Therefore, all theories and policies based on the old balances are of little use today. Yet, I find people still talking in old terms without realizing or appreciating that nothing in the world of today can remain static.

The situation in the Far East is also completely different from what it was in the past. I merely mention this to point out to you that we must be alert about the changing conditions. It is true that we must have principles; we must have ideals and objectives. But that is not enough. The application, the implementation and the working of our principles and ideals depend, to a large extent, on external circumstances. Those circumstances are hardly ever wholly in our control. We have to accept things as they are.

I have no doubt that every one here would like to build a new world according to his heart's desire. Similarly, we also aim to go in a particular direction but it is not always possible, because we cannot ignore certain factors, much less in

a democratic society. Of course, rapid changes consistent with the aims of a government can be brought about in a country even though the wishes of considerable numbers of people have to be disregarded; but such a thing is conceivable only in a particular type of political and economic set-up where one group wields supreme power. We, for instance, cannot ignore large groups. Sometimes the majority has its way, as it should. When hon. Members accuse us of complacency—even of smugness—I feel that they have little understanding of how my mind or that of my colleagues functions. Even if we were so foolish as to be complacent, the circumstances we have to face every day make it impossible for those of us who are in responsible positions to be complacent.

I cannot speak for those who are responsible for the government of other countries but I can certainly speak for my colleagues and for myself. I want to tell you that we approach our problems in all humility of spirit and with feelings utterly devoid of complacency and smugness. We feel that, however small we might be as men, our problems, those of our country and those of the world, are big. We must approach them with all the wisdom we possess and with such experience as we have. Although we have to advance step by step, we must constantly be on the alert so that we can change our step wherever necessary. We must always take counsel with others and never forget to maintain our spirit of humility.

I am anxious to seek help and guidance in every important matter that comes up before this House. Apart from such knowledge as we may have of world history, most of us have been conditioned by India's national movement and have a common background of thought and a common approach to problems. Many of us, thus conditioned, subsequently took different paths and they were entitled to do this. It was not necessary that all of us should have thought alike. Our understanding of problems—ours as well as those of the world—is necessarily influenced by our background which we have to adapt to new conditions as they develop. Having once been part of the nationalist movement, we cannot

possibly think of functioning negatively. Of course, negation inevitably had its place during our fight for freedom but now that we are building India anew, it is imperative that we function positively.

Hon. Members of the Opposition will realize that positive functioning is more difficult because one wrong move can expose the country to danger. Independence has meant added responsibility. Besides our own, we have to try and help solve the problems of the world. Not that we wanted to interfere with the affairs of other countries but in the present circumstances it cannot be avoided. A multitude of political, economic and social issues demand consideration in our own country. Large numbers of these problems had been overlooked for generations but when foreign rule was removed, new problems were added to the old ones and we are supposed to solve the whole lot of them at once. I want you to remember that it is not possible to consider our troubles in a vacuum; nor is it easy to decide what is right and what is wrong; even more difficult is the proper application of what one considers right in principle. In order to do that one must have full control over the situation in the country, if not, indeed, in the world.

Our foreign policy has been criticized from various points of view. The most common criticism is that it is not a policy at all because it is too vague. Some hon. Members believe that we are tied up with the Anglo-American bloc because we expect help from it. Others talk frequently of building up a 'third force' or 'third bloc'. An hon. Member wants us—he says so—to align ourselves with the rival bloc. It is not that he is against an alignment as such but he would rather that we had ties with the other bloc. According to the general consensus of opinion in this country, we should follow a policy independent of this or that bloc. You may, of course, sympathize with one or the other; that is quite another thing. To become part of a power bloc means giving up the right to have a policy of our own and following that of somebody else. Surely, that is not the kind of future any self-respecting person would like to envisage for our great country. I am not saying that we should not co-operate with others or

consult them but at the same time we must follow an independent policy. It is perfectly true that no country can function in a vacuum. To achieve anything, it has to take the rest of the world into account and then decide upon its course of action. Although our foreign policy is a continuation of the stand we took during our struggle for independence, we are, sometimes, constrained to vary it according to circumstances.

A country's foreign policy is really a collection of different policies, though they have a common basic outlook. When we deal with America or England or Russia or Japan or China or Egypt or Indonesia, we have to deal with the peculiar circumstances that obtain in the country concerned as well as with those in each of the rest. No single broad rule can apply in every case, because the nature of our relationship varies with each country. The only rule we can lay down is that we shall try to be friendly with all the countries.

Finally a foreign policy is not just a declaration of fine principles; nor is it a directive to tell the world how to behave. It is conditioned and controlled by a country's own strength. If the policy does not take the capacity of the country into account, it cannot be followed up. If a country talks bigger than it is, it brings little credit to itself. It is easy for you or me to lay down beautiful maxims; but if that is done by a government or nations, it would probably come to nothing. In any case, what do we achieve except the satisfaction of having made fine speeches?

The strength which limits or, at any rate, conditions the foreign policy of a country may be military, financial or, if I may use the word, moral. It is obvious that India has neither military nor financial strength. Furthermore, we have no desire to—and we cannot—impose our will on others. We are, however, anxious to prevent catastrophes and, where possible, to help in the general progress of humanity. We do express our opinion and work for our goals with the limited strength that we have but if we adopt a policy which we are not in a position to implement, we would be discredited ourselves in the eyes of other nations and be dubbed irresponsible. It is difficult for me to praise

or even defend the foreign policy we are pursuing, for I have had a great deal to do with it. I hope I am not being vain when I say that our policy has, indeed, secured us the friendship of a large number of countries. I am confident that today there is no country which is actually hostile to us. Naturally, some countries are more friendly than others but those who are occasionally critical of us do not harbour any permanent resentment against us. We owe this to the policy we are pursuing and the manner in which we are pursuing it. We have tried not to join in the new diplomatic game of maligning, defaming and cursing other countries. That does not necessarily mean that we agree with what they say or do; we may not agree but merely shouting against them does not help, apart from the fact that it is indecorous, too. We have to deal not only with political and economic considerations but also with a large number of imponderables like fear, for instance. It is alarming to see fear gripping some of the largest and most powerful countries in the world. It is heartening—and I think it is true—that although we cannot be compared with the great countries of the world in terms of power, yet, if I may say so, we as a people, are less influenced by the fear psychosis. Of course, some people may attribute this to our ignorance of the facts. Facts certainly have to be reckoned with; but imponderable things also come in the way of humanity and, if we are to deal with them effectively, the least we can do is to adopt a manner that would help rather than hinder. That is to say, we must refrain from merely running down other countries. We can certainly express our opinion when it is necessary; we can say that we do not agree with a country or that certain things are, in our opinion, wrong; but we must not go farther than that.

Mention has been made of a 'third force'. I have not been able to understand quite what it means. If by the term is meant a power bloc, military or other, I am afraid I do not consider it desirable, apart from the fact that it is not feasible either. The biggest countries today are small compared with the two giants. It would be absurd for a number of countries in Asia to come together and call themselves a third force or a third power in a military sense. It may, however, have a

meaning in another sense. Instead of calling it a third force or a third bloc, it can be called a third area, an area which—let us put negatively first—does not want war, works for peace in a positive way and believes in co-operation. I should like my country to work for that. Indeed, we have tried to do so but the idea of a third bloc or a third force inevitably hinders our work. It frightens people, especially those we wish to approach. Those countries, who do not want to align themselves with either of the two powerful blocs and who are willing to work for the cause of peace, should by all means come together; and we, on our part, should do all we can to make this possible. That is our general policy and I think we should follow it without too much of shouting. I am not afraid of shouting but we want to achieve certain things and shouting may embarrass the countries we have to approach.

The Far Eastern problem is on the agenda of UNO and is due for discussion at its next session. I cannot say now what our representatives may have to do then, because so much depends on the circumstances which may develop in the course of the next two weeks or so. All I can say is that they will broadly try to follow the policy we are pursuing. What I wanted was to refer briefly to the Korean Resolution which we sponsored at the United Nations. Ever since the Korean war started, we have been very much concerned with it, not because we wanted to interfere or bully others but because we were perhaps in a position to help more than any other country could. Our relations with the countries in conflict were cordial. This was not true of other countries and, therefore, it was difficult for them to do anything. We realized our peculiar responsibility to the poor people of Korea and strongly felt that the utter ruin and destruction in Korea should be stopped at any cost.

I do not want to go into past history; but several steps were taken by us which did not yield immediate results but which, it was subsequently realized, were the right steps. The very first thing that strikes us about the situation in the Far East and about which we are all agreed is that it is unreal and that unless we deal with that great country, China, we

can do nothing effective. We, therefore, recognized the People's Republic of China right from the beginning and urged other countries in UNO and elsewhere to do the same regardless of whether or not they liked the policies of China. The fact of China is patent enough and not to recognize it was and is a fundamental breach—I do not know if 'breach' is the right word—and contrary to the very spirit and charter of the United Nations. Nobody can say the UNO was supposed only to represent countries subscribing to one policy. That, unfortunately, is the trend that has gradually come to exist at UNO. The result is that a country as tremendous as China has been treated as though it did not exist and a small island off the coast of China is accepted as representing China. That is very extraordinary. My contention is that this fact is the crux of the situation that has developed in the Far East. The non-recognition of realities naturally leads to artificial policies and programmes and that is exactly what is happening.

We had been in continuous touch with the Governments of China, the U.K. and the U.S.A. as well as those of other countries a few months before we sponsored the Korean Resolution at UNO. We were very anxious not to take any step which would embarrass us or some other party because that would only have made it more difficult for us to help. Occasionally we informed one party about the general outlook and point of view of another. We were in a position to do this because the heads of our missions abroad made it a point to keep in touch with the countries they were accredited to. That is why we were able to frame our resolution largely in accordance with the Chinese viewpoint as we thought it to be. I do not say it was a hundred per cent representative of the Chinese viewpoint but it was certainly an attempt to represent it. The burden of it was that in the matter of the exchange of prisoners, the Geneva Convention should be followed.

Let me not be understood to mean that we were committed to the statements made by our representatives to those of China. We only tried to find out how China would like things to be done. It is, of course, not possible for a party, however big, to have its own way in every respect and we did

not overlook this aspect of the problem when we framed our resolution.

Now, another factor to be borne in mind is that this resolution dealt only with the problem of exchange of prisoners. Those who want to know why it did not deal with the question of a ceasefire forget the facts of the case. All of us know that truce negotiations were being carried on at Panmunjon for a year and a half before this. After great difficulty an agreement was arrived at in every matter except that of the exchange of prisoners. Obviously, the primary aim of the truce negotiations was a ceasefire and that was the first consequence of an agreement. Therefore, we took up only the still unsettled question of exchange of prisoners, subject to the settlement of which a ceasefire had already been agreed upon. The principles which governed the resolution had been drawn up in great detail before it was actually framed. Those principles were communicated to the People's Government of China for their opinion early last November. A fortnight passed—I am speaking from memory about the period—and we were told that our communication was being carefully considered. I might say that on many occasions we had been encouraged by various Governments, including the Chinese Government, to persevere in our endeavours for peace. It was not our desire to thrust ourselves where we were not wanted. It is true that the Chinese Government had not committed itself to co-operating with us but it had not refused to do so either and we felt that we might safely go ahead. It may have been a wrong decision but we made considerable progress and things were developing. There was no great difference between the principles we had drawn up and the final resolution. Anyhow, we sent the latter to the parties concerned and a few days elapsed—I forget how many—before we actually proposed the resolution. As the House will remember, the first reaction to it was one of disapproval and an immediate rejection on the part of the United States Government. Till then we had no idea what the reaction of the Chinese and Soviet Governments would be. They, at length, informed us that they did not approve of it. Naturally, we were greatly disappointed. What were we to do then?

Some people are of the opinion that we should have withdrawn the resolution at that stage. It is true that the mere passing of a resolution has little meaning when the aim is an agreed settlement. We realized that; but, on the other hand, there were not many alternatives. Before we put our resolution to UNO there were a number of others, all of which were, if I may say so, aggressive and would certainly have made the situation much worse. We did not approve of them and would have voted against them had the occasion presented itself. A resolution proposed by the Soviet Union or by some other country of Eastern Europe laid stress on the importance of an immediate ceasefire. We should have welcomed a ceasefire but it was absolutely clear that the resolution would not be passed. Many countries felt that if the issue of prisoners could not be resolved after a whole year's argument, in spite of the presence of a war, it would never be resolved even if a ceasefire took place. Therefore, they preferred to continue negotiations till all the issues could be decided once and for all to the satisfaction of all parties concerned. This was the difficulty so far as our resolution was concerned. Furthermore, it has been very largely supported but some of the principal parties concerned unfortunately did not agree to it. As a matter of fact, the resolution was not ours but one that had been sponsored by the House. We had to adopt a realistic course but we did not know whether or not we should withdraw the resolution and let matters drift. The resolution, however, was not a mandate but in the nature of a proposal and we thought it might possibly help in the further consideration of the subject.

May I say one other thing in this connection? I understand that some Members have disapproved of our action in sending a medical unit to Korea. We sent this unit to Korea purely for medical relief work and, I must say, it has done remarkably well, gaining for itself, in addition, some very valuable experience. Of its kind, it is one of the best units in the world today. It did not take part in the fighting because, though we are prepared to give medical succour, we have nothing to do with the war as such.

I am afraid I have taken a long time over this matter

and I should like to pass on to another subject. I am told that my friend, Acharya Narendra Dev, whose opinion I value very greatly, expressed himself in despondent tones about the economic situation in the country and said that the Five Year Plan was not likely to succeed.

It is not easy to take an overall view of the economic situation in the country and sum it up in a few sentences. None of us can take a complacent view of it but the point is how to overcome our difficulties in regard to food, land, industry and, ultimately better production and better distribution. All this was considered at great length when the Five Year Plan was formulated.

The main virtue of the Five Year Plan is that we have come to grips with our problems for the first time. Theoretical approaches have their place and are, I suppose, essential but a theory must be tempered with reality. In this instance, we have to realize that we cannot go far beyond our resources. And I think that in the Five Year Plan we have come to realistic conclusions, not forgetting our objectives. I should like the pace at which we are making progress to increase and, indeed, I shall be very happy if hon. Members would suggest practical measures to achieve this end.

I believe that the food situation has improved considerably and I am sure that, of the various factors responsible, Government policy is certainly one. People refer to the famine or near-famine conditions that prevailed in Rayalaseema last year and do in parts of Karnataka and Bombay State this year. They are right. I would, however, like the House to remember that though we use the word 'famine' today—I do not like using the word—we do so in an entirely different sense than we did in the old days when the British were here. Then, a famine meant millions of people dying like flies. Whereas, if a person dies of hunger or from other causes today, there is an outcry of protest. There is, at the present moment, a new political consciousness and I am very glad about it. In the Bengal famine of 1942-43, 35 lakhs of people died. And I do suggest that the situation is vastly different now. I mention this because a foreign visitor went to the famine areas the other day. He said: 'You talk about famine

in these areas! I do not find any people dead or dying. This is not a famine.' Doubtless, he had got his conception of famine from the British days.

It is no small achievement that in spite of tremendous natural calamities, such as the failure of the rains and drought, which affected vast areas, the State Governments, with the co-operation of the Central Government, have prevented the situation from deteriorating and have controlled it by giving work or doles. Unfortunately, they could not always prevent misery and hunger. The Government of Bombay State, for instance, recognizes its responsibility of providing food in scarcity areas whether it is through works—which some hon. Members must have seen in Rayalaseema and in the Karnataka areas—or other means. Two years ago, a huge administrative venture was undertaken with considerable success in Bihar. Unfortunately, we cannot deal satisfactorily with accidents, such as the failure of the monsoons. As I said, natural calamities have done considerable damage but we are building up our strength so as to be able to deal with the situation. It is difficult to cope with great disasters; but we should be able to overcome natural calamities in the course of the next two or three years. By then, I think, it should be possible—I dare not give any promise—to become more or less self-sufficient in food.

Some people say that we are always talking about agriculture to the neglect of industry. I attach the greatest importance to the development of industry but I doubt whether any real industrial development can take place in India till we have a firm basis for our agriculture. Of course, we must make progress on all fronts. The nation's economic growth is no simple matter. We have to plan the nation's savings and long term investments with great care. Saving for future generations means exerting some pressure on the present generation. It means, if I may say so, a certain austerity. It is all very well for an authoritarian government to dictate a policy it considers good for the country; but it is not so easy for a democratic country to do so. It is difficult to ask people to starve today to have jam tomorrow. Even great countries like the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. took 150 years to

build themselves up. Those hon. Members who are acquainted with history know that this meant extreme suffering for their working classes. The proprietors themselves were not men who liked luxury; they were austere people who saved so that their industrial apparatus might grow and they did this at a terrible cost. It was not difficult to do this in England where Parliament at that time was controlled by a small group of propertied people. Conditions were different in America where there were vast areas. We are differently situated in many ways; for one thing, we have an enormous population which grows every year and which has to be maintained. Also, we have adult suffrage in a democratic set-up.

Some people suggest that we should have a capital levy in order to save for investment. Others want to improve the general standard of living which, apart from the psychological good it may do, will not gain much for us. What really counts is the increase in our rate of production. To build up an adequate apparatus for an increase in future production, you naturally have to save today. To do this and to solve our other problems, we must have definite industrial, financial and land policies. Therefore, we have inaugurated the Five Year Plan and the great point in its favour is that it has made people plan-conscious generally. It has also made us aware of the basic realities, such as the true nature of our position and resources. Of course, we can vary the Plan whenever we like, although it is dangerous to think of changing it constantly.

The House will remember that in the President's Address there is a reference to the Welfare State. He has also said that the real test of progress lies in the growth of employment and in the ultimate ending of unemployment. Obviously, there can be no Welfare State if there is unemployment. Anyhow, the unemployed themselves are not parties to the Welfare State but just outside its pale. To realize the ideal of a Welfare State requires hard work, tremendous effort and co-operation from us and I appeal to this House and to the country to give us that co-operation.

Finally, I should like to say a few words about the Praja

Parishad agitation. My friend, the hon. Acharya Narendra Dev, referred to it and said that in his opinion it was a wholly communal agitation initiated by those who had been supporters of the former Maharaja and the landed gentry. He also suggested that an investigation should be made to find out why this agitation, which was primarily a class agitation, should have affected other people. I agree that there should be an investigation but we must remember that some aspects of this question may not be as well known as others. To understand the significance of the agitation, we must distinguish its purely economic aspect from the other, which is political, constitutional and, perhaps, even international.

As the House knows, an official commission, with the Chief Justice of the State—a very responsible and able officer—as its president, has been appointed to deal with economic matters. Had the commission been non-official, it should immediately have been condemned as not being representative. I submit to the House that it was hardly possible for the Kashmir Government to appoint a commission constituted by the very people who were against the former. If it had appointed non-officials, other non-officials might have said: 'These are your party men.' I think the Kashmir Government very wisely appointed a purely official commission whose findings it can accept and give effect to.

Many things are said about other matters which are of a political nature. The hon. Member who spoke before me said something about our National Flag. The Constituent Assembly of Kashmir has repeatedly said that the Union Flag is the supreme flag of Kashmir State as it is of the rest of India and it has, therefore, been displayed from time to time. It is interesting to note that many of those who talk about their respect for the National Flag have, in the past, openly declared their intention to replace it by their own party flag. Communal organizations, be they in Jammu or in Delhi, have seldom shown respect for our flag and now they exploit it in order to gain other people's goodwill for this agitation. My chief grievance and sorrow in this matter is that legitimate things have been exploited for unworthy objectives.

There is nobody here who does not want the State of Jammu and Kashmir to have the closest association with India. There is no difference of opinion on this objective but the way that has been pursued has made its realization very difficult. Our union with Jammu and Kashmir State can only be based on the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir; we are not going to achieve a union at the point of the bayonet. Our policy, therefore, should be to try and win them over instead of frightening them. We must not disturb the status of Jammu and Kashmir State but let it remain a separate entity in the Union of India. The accession of Jammu and Kashmir State was identical with that of any other State in India, although it was thought at the time that there might be a variation in the degree to which States would be integrated with India in the future. We certainly did not think it possible that all the States could be integrated with India to the same degree. I am talking of 1947 or perhaps early 1948. When Jammu and Kashmir State acceded, it did so as fully as any other State, so that the question of partial accession does not arise. I should especially like to point this out to people who talk about the reference to the United Nations on the possibility of a plebiscite. This does not detract from Kashmir's accession to India in any way. The accession is complete. Accession must, however, be distinguished from integration. Jammu and Kashmir State acceded first and then integrated as the other States had done and in the same degree. However, the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel wisely followed a policy of fuller integration for the other States; but in the nature of things, we could not follow a similar policy in Kashmir where a war, which had almost become an international issue, was going on.

Last year, the question of further accession arose—not as such but in connection with certain other arrangements with Kashmir. The agreement between the Governments of India and Kashmir had to do with a number of things to which this House agreed and the implementation of which was tantamount to a further degree of integration.

We are sometimes asked why that agreement has not been fully implemented yet. The question is apparently

justified but the fact is that the Jammu and Kashmir Government is even more than the others, an autonomous government. It is up to it to shoulder the responsibility for the situations it may have to face. If something happens in Bengal or Bombay or Madras, we can only give advice because they are autonomous States and must deal with the local situation themselves. The same is true of Kashmir also. We cannot order the Government of Kashmir about or foist a time-table on it. We leave it to it to judge its own affairs and take such action as it deems fit.

In view of the war and the other events which have given it an international significance, Kashmir had to be treated as a special case. The Jammu Praja Parishad agitation started the very day the agreement between the Governments of India and Kashmir was given effect to in part and when the new head of the State, the Sadar-e-Riyasat, elected by the Kashmir Assembly and approved by our President, arrived in Jammu. The Parishad workers tried to interfere with the welcome given to the Yuvaraj and tore the triumphal arch down. That was how it started but it has continued ever since. Had the Kashmir Government been anxious to implement the rest of the agreement, it could not have done so without dealing with the existing situation first. Its hands were thus tied to some extent because of the agitation. The history of Kashmir, going back a little over a hundred years, bears evidence that the State has had to experience repeated conquest, transfer, purchase and so on. The Jammu province of the State was most important from political and other points of view just as Hyderabad was in the old days when the Muslim community dominated. Now, things are completely different. Naturally, Hyderabad has changed. The feudal order that existed has gone, taking with it the big *jagirs* and inevitably causing considerable distress among those who depended on that feudal order as also among those who depended on the armed forces which were disbanded. I cannot compare the two; there are very great differences. But there are resemblances, too, because both Jammu and Hyderabad had dominant groups which resisted the political changes that were taking place and disapproved of the new

land reform. Also, the background of the economic difficulties of both has some common features.

The agitation soon assumed a violent form. I have here with me particulars of over a hundred officers of the Jammu and Kashmir Government—Deputy Commissioners, Superintendents of Police, schoolmasters and constables—who have been injured. Numerous school buildings have been ransacked, furniture and other things destroyed and small Government offices and treasuries looted. This is a curious kind of 'peaceful' *satyagraha*. However, the Kashmir Government has to deal with the situation but the agitation will, as the House must realize, have unfortunate repercussions. The demand of the Parishad is the complete integration of Jammu with India but if Jammu were to have its wishes carried out and Kashmir were left out of the picture, it would obviously amount to the disruption of the State.

This is an extraordinary attitude to adopt and it can certainly aid and comfort the enemies of India. I am amazed when responsible people in India support an agitation which can only result in injury to India as a whole and the people of Jammu inevitably. If the agitation succeeds, it will be the people of Jammu who will suffer. I had occasion to read reports of some of the speeches made in the course of the agitation. Appeals were made to subvert the Government of India so that a different policy could be followed. Everybody has a right to ask for his own government but such demands on the part of the Jammu Parishad were merely an excuse for something bigger. Whether or not the demands are feasible is a matter which is being discussed at Geneva at the moment. Naturally, we are anxious that this conflict should end, normality should return and legitimate grievances be removed. I am certain that the Kashmir Government is as anxious as we are but how are we to decide complicated constitutional and international problems? It is difficult for us to discuss them with other people because we have to consult so many parties. We are supposed to discuss these problems in the market place with the Praja Parishad people! I just do not understand how this can be done.

Principal Devaprasad Ghosh suggested that the question

of the aggressors and the plebiscite in Kashmir should be discussed at Geneva. I had discussions with the leaders of the Jan Sangh about how the aggressors can be got rid of. However, the question involves military matters, political matters, constitutional and national matters. Since Pakistan is the aggressor, the question involves the entire problem of war and peace between India and Pakistan. Let us realize the nature and depth of the problem and discuss it dispassionately. By connecting it with the Jammu Parishad agitation, we are giving it a communal outlook and that, I think, is fatal for the whole country. It will disrupt the country and put an end to our freedom. And there is such a wide gap between the two approaches that one cannot be too optimistic about the possibility of an agreement.

My honourable friend Dr Kunzru showed grave concern and expressed his disapproval of the fact that certain persons in the Punjab had been arrested and detained in the course of the past week or ten days. I believe about a dozen or so have been arrested. I do not know whether Dr Kunzru meant that under no circumstances should a person be so arrested and detained or whether he thought that in the peculiar circumstances now prevailing in the Punjab this should not have been done.

If he means the former, I would submit that it is difficult to agree with him and, indeed, I cannot do so; nor can any other country agree with him in a final sense. Of course, it is a thing which should not normally be done and I hope it is not normally done; but it is done under the stress of special circumstances. When the Punjab became a source of supply to the people of Jammu, the latter used all kinds of methods to excite the people there and to create trouble on communal lines. Their techniques are still being employed in Delhi and in some cities of western U.P. Processions are being taken out with the shouting of explosive slogans. Surely, that can lead to a very grave situation. Some of the trouble occurred almost within a stone's throw of the cease-fire line. Since the Pakistan forces were on the other side, we were anxious that our Army should keep completely out of this. In fact, the disturbances were planned presumably

to excite the Army. I know that the Punjab Government was gravely concerned for weeks because the ultimate responsibility was theirs, whether they did anything or not.

I am sorry to have taken up so much of your time but the subjects before the House in connection with the President's Address cover not only India but the world and responsibility largely falls upon us, as a Parliament, to face our problems with dignity and restraint, always keeping our principles before us and always in a spirit of humility.

THE PSYCHOSIS OF FEAR

THIS House has been debating this Motion for four days and we have covered many subjects, big and small. We have ranged all over the world and considered the problems of India. I find it a little difficult to deal with all the issues in the course of my reply. I hope the House will permit me to deal only with what I consider to be the more important of them. That, I feel, would be better than to divert the attention of the House to a maze of minor subjects, which, no doubt, are important in themselves but which are, nevertheless, insignificant in the larger scheme of things today.

I should like to say that I have endeavoured to consider these matters as dispassionately and as objectively as possible. I have also tried to profit by the comments and criticisms made. I shall, however, repudiate the charge of complacency and smugness that has been levelled against me and my colleagues. I cannot conceive how any person charged with responsibility can be complacent today. Even if he were so inclined, he cannot afford to be so. I certainly do not have any feeling of complacency when I view the problems of this country and the world. I have sometimes a sensation akin to excitement when I think of the tremendous drama that is taking place in the world. I also experience a sense of high

Speech in reply to debate on the President's Address in the House of the People, New Delhi, February 18, 1953

adventure when I consider what we are endeavouring to do in this country in spite of the tremendous difficulties that perpetually confront us. If hon. Members would only take the trouble to read what I sometimes say outside this House, they will discover that I always warn my colleagues against complacency. By no means do we think that we have all the wisdom. Any person who is dogmatic is necessarily complacent. Complacency comes when one's mind is closed and one accepts a dogmatic phrase. Complacency is a narrowness of outlook in the changing world of today.

I said a little while ago that I have endeavoured to consider these matters dispassionately. At this point, I would like to express to the House, in particular to the hon. Dr Syama Prasad Mookerjee, my regret that I let myself be provoked into a temper for a moment yesterday.

Before I proceed, I should like to deal with something brought up by another hon. Member of the Opposition. The hon. Member, Prof. Hirendra Nath Mukerjee, referred to the landing of thousands of American military aircraft at Dum Dum. I shall read out what the hon. Member said. He referred to a U.S. Superfortress landing at the IAF Station Agra, early in December 1952. He went on to say:

"Why is it that we hear—I want to be corrected later by the Prime Minister, if I am wrong—that in October 1952 there were as many as 3,250 military landings at Dum Dum Airport, out of which the contribution of the Indian Air Force was only 25 while that of the United States Air Force came to the tune of 1,200."

I was so amazed at this statement that I enquired into the matter. If the facts were as stated above, one could justifiably imagine that a large scale invasion of India was in progress. The facts as ascertained are as follows: No Superfortress visited Agra in December or at any other time but an old military type of aircraft, converted for civilian use, is kept by the American Embassy and is based at Palam. This aircraft visited Agra aerodrome on December 9, 1952 and returned to Delhi the same day. The Dum Dum aerodrome near Calcutta, however, is on the international route and is visited daily by a very large number of aircraft belonging

to different international lines flying from east to west and west to east.

All these flights are subject to international rules and usage. Sometimes, though rarely, permission is given to fly over India without landing anywhere in the country. Normally, foreign aircraft have to land at some airport in India for examination and checks of various kinds. Military aircraft belonging to a foreign State can fly to and across India only with the prior approval of the Government of India and in accordance with an agreement entered into by that State with the Government of India. In the whole of the year 1952, 459 military aircraft landed at Dum Dum. Of these, only 118 belonged to the U.S. Air Force. None of these American aircraft carried arms or ammunition or personnel in uniform. The Indian Air Force has its headquarters at Palam and, therefore, relatively few landings take place at Dum Dum.

We are concerned with both the international situation and domestic situation. Even though we may consider them separately, they are, to some extent, related. I do not suppose there is any disagreement in this House about our ideal of the Welfare State. The question is how to attain that end; and certainly, there might well be difference of opinion in regard to the means. Anyhow, the building up of a new India is a tremendous adventure. Can there be anything more exciting than the idea that the Welfare State of our dreams will raise hundreds of millions of people to a fuller way of life? Our problem is that, for a fairly long period, the country did not grow as naturally as it might have done. It seems as though a number of centuries, all jostled up together, have suddenly been hurled into the middle of the 20th century. This is not a matter one can really understand in an academic debate. India's vast regions are by no means uniform; they are all at different stages of economic, industrial and agricultural growth. We are trying to develop the whole country more or less at the same time and if we are not able to perform miracles, we can hardly be blamed. However, while we are engaged in this gigantic and difficult task, we have little time to spare for and little energy to give to inter-

national affairs. But we do not have much choice in the matter because international affairs hit us in the face. It is part of India's destiny that she should play her part in these affairs like other countries whether she wishes to or not. We are part of the international community and no country, much less a large country like India, can remain isolated from it. So, we are of necessity involved in international affairs which grow more and more complicated every day.

The United Nations Organization came into existence seven or eight years ago and it represented the timeless urge of humanity for peace. The League of Nations, even at its commencement, was not what might be called an international organization with a universal background. Great countries kept out of it and were kept out of it. The United Nations at the time of its inauguration was, at least, based on a presumption of universality, because it symbolized the longing among all peoples for the return of peace. Countries differing from one another in the structure of government, economic and political policy and in a great many other respects were able to come together under the huge umbrella of the United Nations. So that, the first attribute of the United Nations—at least, the supposed attribute—may be said to have been universality. The other attribute was the main objective, namely, the maintenance of peace, the growth of co-operative effort among nations and the solution of disputes by peaceful means as far as possible. The United Nations laid down a rule concerning the veto of certain great Powers. It is very easy to criticize that rule as illogical, undemocratic and all that but, as a matter of fact, the rule recognized the reality of the moment. The United Nations could not adopt sanctions against any of the great Powers. Such sanctions could be vetoed and would, in any case, mean a world war. If the United Nations was to avoid a world war, it had to bring in some such clause. Let us see how such a situation actually developed.

First of all, we find that the principle of universality with which the United Nations started has been departed from. A great country like China is not given recognition at the

United Nations. Whether we like or dislike the present Government in China or whether we approve or disapprove of China's revolution is not at all relevant to the patent fact. The basic principle of universality has been abandoned by the United Nations. This is a return to the attitude that caused the League of Nations to fail. The matter does not end with expressing an academic opinion; the failure of the United Nations to give recognition to a country which is obviously stable and strong has given rise to fresh problems of a universal character.

This great organization built for peace is itself engaged in war sponsoring today. I am not blaming anybody but only trying to analyse the situation as objectively as I can. Is it possible that the world has not grown up and is incapable of having an international organization for peace? I do not know. People talk about a united world; many wise, intelligent and ardent people advocate the ideal of world federalism but we again and again prove ourselves unable to give effect to it. Is it possible for countries entirely different from one another in their political, economic and other policies to co-operate or must they remain apart? There was a time, centuries ago, when it did not much matter whether they did or not because there was no natural contact. Today, there is continuous contact, which can be friendly or hostile. I find myself wondering again and again whether an international organization, containing within its core countries with entirely different aims, can exist. I feel sure it can and, what is more, see no reason why it should not function efficiently. After all, when the United Nations was started, countries like the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. did co-operate and come together before they drifted apart. For my part, I do not see why they should not be able to function together in an organization, provided, of course, they did not interfere with one another and so long as each was free to carry on the policy it chose for itself. Difficulties arise only when there are attempts at interference. Then, of course, there is conflict and it is very difficult to find out who started the interfering. Charges and counter-charges are made and things rapidly go from bad to worse.

Another thing that intimately concerns us and to which we must give recognition is the tremendous pace of technological development. We, who live in the technological world, do not wholly appreciate that it is making all the difference to the world. The development of communications and the huge strides taken in the art of warfare throw us together all the time. This has created a situation in which a world war, should it occur, will cause such destruction that no objective for which it is fought can ever be realized through it.

In the circumstances, what can a country like India do? We cannot influence other countries by force or arms or pressure or money. We can only do things negatively and what we can do positively is not much. To imagine that we will shake the world or fashion international affairs according to our thinking, as hon. Members seem to believe sometimes, is absurd. We cannot issue ultimatums or make demands; nor can we express our views in strong language to the world at large because it has little meaning unless we are in a position to do something about it. Members of the Opposition have repeatedly complained that the President has used weak, circumspect language and failed to say things forcefully one way or the other. I would beg of them to remember that in the modern world, strength does not reside in strong language. Nor does it reside in slogans. I hope India is, with all her failings, a mature nation with a tradition of restraint, a few thousand years old. A mature nation does not and should not shout too much. I regret that there is far too much shouting and cursing in the world today. It may be perfectly justified but it is not good all the same. The world is up against a grave problem. Two giant countries dislike each other, try to undermine each other and yet are terribly afraid of each other. We seem to be surrounded by fear and hatred and that is the worst thing that can happen to a country.

We cannot do much about it but it is certainly within our power not to do anything or say anything which will increase the fear and the hatred. We should not indulge in the contest of shouting, cursing and slandering which seems to have

replaced diplomacy. Where we can help positively, we should help, although there is always the risk that our attempts may fail. We have been very cautious about our positive steps. We have, however, endeavoured with a great deal of success not to take part in controversies or in running other nations down.

I must say, however, that whenever we have done anything it has been in the hope that it will help the cause of peace and a deeper understanding among nations. For instance, there was the matter of the Korean Resolution. We tried our utmost to find out what the other countries concerned were prepared to accept or do. It is impossible to find out everything but we did proceed on a sound enough basis. About 90 or 95 per cent of what we put forward in that resolution was almost a verbatim report of what had been said to us separately by the parties concerned. I am not justifying our actions; my point is that we have always tried earnestly to put one party's viewpoint before the other without compromising anything. Well, we failed in the case of the Korean Resolution and must suffer for that failure.

Some hon. Members on the other side of the House are constantly repeating, as if it were a *mantra* which they had learnt without understanding it, that we are stooges of the Americans, that we are part of the Anglo-American bloc and so on. Of course, such a statement, in the case of persons who are less restrained than I am, might have led to a retort but I do not wish to indulge in that kind of thing. I should like them and others to make an effort to keep out of the habit of learning a few slogans and phrases and repeating them over and over again. That becomes quite stale.

My point is that peace requires peaceful methods. The House will remember that Gandhiji always laid stress on the question of means and ends. I am not entering into a metaphysical argument but surely, if you demand peace, you must work for it peacefully. A large number of countries, big and small, talk about peace in an aggressive and warlike manner. This does not apply to one group more than to another; it applies almost to everybody. In fact, one might say that peace is now spelt WAR. We are steadily acquiring

the military mentality while statesmanship has taken second place.

A soldier is a very excellent person in his own domain but somebody once said—I think it was a French statesman—that even war was too serious a thing to be handed over to a soldier to control, much less peace. This incursion of the military mentality in the Chancelleries of the world is a dangerous development. How can we meet it? I confess that we in India cannot make too much of a difference. Of course, we cannot take the world on our shoulders and remodel it according to our heart's desire; but we can help in creating a climate of peace which is so essential for the realization of our objectives.

There are many causes of war—some often discussed and others hidden. Owing to a number of factors, chiefly technological developments, political developments, nationalist movements and the like, vast masses of people all over the world have ceased to be quiescent. That is a good thing. People in colonial countries, for instance, are no longer prepared to suffer or to put up with their present lot. Naturally, they take notice of anything that appears to them to be a liberating force; they are attracted by it. The 'liberating force' may not actually liberate them; it might even make things worse. The whole world is in a fluid state, men's minds have been moved and perturbed and they seek somethings to support them and to guide them.

One would have thought that the first thing to do in such a state of affairs would have been to remove the patent grievances of the masses of downtrodden people. The problem of colonialism has certainly been tackled to a considerable extent in the few years since the war ended. It should be dealt with still further and thus at least one of the causes of dissatisfaction will be removed. That, I am afraid, has not been done. Also, the tendency to look at the countries of Asia as though they were on the outer fringe of things must be checked. One of the most important developments of our age has been what has taken place and is likely to take place in Asia. Asia is today very wide awake, resurgent, active and somewhat rebellious. These facts raise certain psycho-

logical problems whether it is in Asia or in Africa. There is not the shadow of a doubt that the approach that is being made in large parts of Africa is bound to fail. It does not require a prophet to say that this approach will lead to racial conflicts which will have the most dangerous consequences. The steps that are being taken in South Africa may not be related to the situation in the Far East or in Central Europe and Germany but they are basic facts which may do much to shape the world of tomorrow.

What policy can India pursue in this matter? As I said, whatever the policy we decide to pursue, we should talk in a quiet voice and not shout. We should talk in terms of peace, not of threats or curses of war. We must try to convert strong feeling into strength and not into bad temper. There are only two ways of approaching the problem of international relations. One is the conviction that, even though we try to avoid it, war is bound to come. Therefore, we should prepare for it and when it comes, join this party or that. The other way starts with the feeling that war can be avoided. Now, there is a great difference in these two approaches. If you are mentally convinced that war is bound to come, you naturally accustom yourself to the idea and, perhaps unconsciously, even work for it. On the other hand, if you want to work for the avoidance of war, you must believe that it can be avoided. Of course, no country can entirely ignore the possibility of being entangled in a war; it must take such precautions as it ought to. I do not think people anywhere want war but somehow they have come to the conclusion that it must come. So far as we are concerned, we do not believe that war is inevitable, although it is a dangerous possibility. Apart from the political or diplomatic field, one can work for its avoidance even in the psychological field.

The House is aware that certain statements have been made in the United States of America by the highest authorities in regard to the Far East. These have caused grave concern not only to us here but in many countries all over the world. I confess that it is not clear to me even now exactly what the implications of these statements are. But, whatever the meaning behind them, there is no doubt about the

impression they have created and the reactions they have produced. From the point of view of world psychology, they have had a disastrous effect. All this talk of the blockade of China obviously does not conduce to peace or settlement. I must say that we as a government and, I am sure, as a people, view these developments with the greatest concern. It is no good using strong language. That will not impress anybody more than the quiet statements we might make. Our opinion, for what it is worth, has been conveyed quite clearly.

Hon. Members of the Opposition have talked a great deal about hunger and starvation in India. I believe there is an amendment to the effect that the economic situation has deteriorated.

It is easy in a country like India to prepare a catalogue of the suffering and distress and poverty that exist. The test, however, is whether (or not) we are getting over these difficulties, how far we have gone, how far we are likely to go and what steps we are taking. Objectively, there is no doubt that the economic situation in the country has improved considerably. It is not a matter of judgment but of facts and figures. I think the lot of the peasantry—I am not for the moment talking of the landless labourer—has improved greatly. This is a great, big country and it is very difficult to make generalizations, because there will always be exceptions. The landless labourer is very important and we should do our utmost for him. In some cases, the landless labourer has also done well; in others, he has not. The industrial population certainly is not worse. It is, if anything, better than it has been during the last few years. In spite of a growing population, the general condition of the people is, I think, better. I admit that does not mean much, since the standard we start with is very low, indeed.

Some people seem to be greatly impressed by the economic progress made by the Soviet Union. But, in spite of that great progress, the standards of living in the Soviet Union and in America are very different. That is not a condemnation of the Soviet Union. The fact is that the standard of living in the United States is the highest in the world. The Russian Revolution took place in November 1917. Ten years later,

let us say in 1927, what was the progress made? I admire the progress they made and appreciate that they had civil wars and tremendous difficulties but what I am pointing out is that their progress should not be compared with that of America. It should be judged in relation to where they started from at the time of the Revolution. In other words, it is the pace of growth that must be judged.

Similarly, it is not fair to compare India with China. I do not mean to imply that we are cleverer than China or that we are going ahead faster. The Chinese are an amazing people—amazing in the sense of their capacity for hard work and for co-operative work. I doubt if there are any other people quite equal to them in this respect. But between us, there is a very big difference, the effects of which it remains for history to show. The difference is that we are trying to function in a democratic set-up. It is no good saying that we are better or more virtuous than others. No question of virtue is involved in this. Ultimately, it is a question of which set-up and which structure of government—political or economic—pays the highest dividends. When I say highest dividends, I do not mean merely material dividends although they are important but cultural and spiritual dividends also. Intellectual freedom is an important factor, certainly; but the future will show its worth. We have deliberately chosen a democratic set-up and we feel that it is good for our people and for our country in the ultimate analysis. Nevertheless, it sometimes slows down the pace of growth for we have to weigh the demands of tomorrow with the needs of today in the building up of our country.

A country, which is poor in resources, does not have the means to invest for the future and the country is pressed between the needs of today and the demands of tomorrow. If you want a surplus, you have to be strict with yourself in the present. And democracy does not like stinting in the present—not usually. In times of great crisis, it might. Democracy wants today the good things of today. That is the disadvantage of democracy.

We talk a great deal about democracy but in its present shape and form it is a relatively new concept. The old type of

democracy was a limited one in many ways. Now we have adult suffrage and the biggest electorate in the world. With all my admiration and love for democracy, I am not prepared to accept the statement that the largest number of people are always right.

We know how people can be excited and their passions roused in a moment. Is this House prepared to submit to the momentary passion of a democratic crowd? Was not democracy functioning five and a half years ago when people were killing one another and millions of them were migrating to escape from atrocities and horror? I do not blame those poor people but I do say that even democracy can go mad; democracy can be incited to do wrong. Democracy, in fact, is sometimes more warlike than individuals who at least have some training.

In any case, we have to build India according to democratic methods. We have decided to do so because we feel that democracy offers society something of the highest human values. But war puts an end to the very values that democracy cherishes. Democracy, in fact, is a casualty of war in the world today. It does not seem to function properly any more. That has been the tragedy of the last two world wars and something infinitely worse is likely to happen if there is another war.

I would beg hon. Members to take this fact into consideration. I have no objection to their criticizing the Government or even condemning it but they must not help in creating an atmosphere of depression and frustration in the country. The psychology of the people is more important than any decree of the Government. My personal impression of the country cannot, perhaps, be a hundred per cent true of the whole country. But I know something of my people. I make an effort to understand them and it has been my high privilege to have their affection and confidence. During the last five or six months I have found that people, in their enthusiasm, have sometimes undertaken almost all the plans that we have put forward and often voluntarily. The few hundred miles of road they have made or the tanks they have dug are, of course, important in themselves. But infinitely

more important is the spirit which went into this work. That is the spirit we count on; that is that spirit which will make the Five Year Plan and our other plans a success.

I referred just now to the Five Year Plan. Many hon. Members have criticized it. As I have said before, there is nothing sacrosanct about the Plan. We have laid down certain policies about land, food, etc. I think they are good policies. Convince us to the contrary and we will change them. But it is no good telling us to do things which are beyond our resources. We are prepared to take risks but intelligent risks. We cannot gamble with the heavy responsibility of carrying out this Plan. Even so, legitimate risks have certainly to be taken, for we realize that the policy of being too cautious is the greatest risk of all. An hon. Member mentioned our industrial policy. We believe that it is essential for India to be industrialized. We also believe that our industrial policy should be based on the development of basic industries like steel and so on. But we realize that our industrial development must have the foundation of a strong agricultural economy if it is to endure. Even if that were not so, the aspect of food as such is important enough; if we do not have food in the country and have to depend on other countries, it will be an ill day for us. We must aim at being self-sufficient in food; otherwise any industrial structure we build up will topple over.

I was just saying that the community projects have been in existence for the last two or three months. Some are functioning extraordinarily well, some moderately well, others not well at all. But, on the whole, I think we are doing satisfactorily.

May I say a few words in regard to the subject which completely occupied Dr Mookerjee during his speech yesterday? He spoke on the Praja Parishad agitation in Jammu. I have no doubt that it is a matter of importance but we should always assess the relative importance of things. When we draw up a plan, it pays us to give priority to certain things and attend to them first. We cannot do everything at once. An eminent person said long ago, that you cannot discard truth but it makes all the difference in the world

whether you put truth in the first place or in the second. Similarly, in considering a problem, whether it is political or economic, the order of priorities you give is most important, especially for this House, since it has to shoulder the burden of the governance of India. It is true that we have to think of the details also but if once we lose sight of the whole, then we are lost in a maze.

The hon. Dr Syama Prasad Mookerjee was very indignant at the abuse hurled at him and his colleagues. The only thing he could resent is that he was called communal. First of all, let me express my pleasure at the discovery that he considers communalism an abusive term. I hope he will gradually convert his colleagues to the same point of view. I seem to remember that at one time he took pride in being communal.

An hon. Member talked of the 'right type' of communalism. I am afraid I do not understand what he means. We remember the occurrences in the autumn of 1947. And finally, we also remember January 30, when the greatest of us was shot down by a foolish youth. I do not quite know how the hon. Member interprets the last thirty years of India's history. The normal analysis has been that there are, in India, various kinds of forces. There are some Rightists, some Leftists and others that are neither. The Rightist groups have gradually found that they could not be effective in a purely social sphere. They have, therefore, taken advantage of the cloak of religion to cover up their reactionary policies, have exploited the name of religion in politics and have excited people's passions in that name. This was done with a tremendous degree of success by the Muslim League. It was done by some Hindu and Sikh organizations also. There is a basic weakness in us as a national community. Our caste system, our provincialism and our regionalism have all encouraged us to live in compartments. I am glad to say that we are now growing out of it. I have no doubt that India would not have been partitioned but for communalism. The narrow outlook of trying to gain a favour for this group or that community at the expense of the larger good has weakened us in the past. It was only in the measure that we got over it—and we got over it in the past on account of

our national movement—that we gained our freedom; but we did not get over it adequately enough to prevent the partition. In the modern world, you cannot employ force in dealing with people. You cannot hold them by the bayonet. You must hold their minds and their hearts. Of course, you can excite them at any moment but in the long run you have to win their goodwill.

We have in India 40 million Muslims—as big a number as any other Muslim country has excepting Pakistan and Indonesia. Pakistan, in any case, is split up into two. Neither East Pakistan nor West Pakistan has as many Muslims as India. Any propaganda, that gives these people a sense of insecurity or makes them feel that they do not have the same opportunities for development and progress as everybody else, is an anti-national thing and a communal thing. I submit that such propaganda is going on and that there are organizations in the country whose sole purpose seems to be to promote it.

An hon. Member talked a great deal about the full integration of Jammu and Kashmir State with India. I think that the proper integration of India is a major question and I give it the highest priority. Compared to it, I would give even the Five Year Plan the second priority. By integration I do not only mean constitutional and legal integration but the integration of the minds and hearts of the people of India. We have inherited a strong tradition of unity, built largely on two contradictory factors. The first was our subjection to British rule and the other the national movement. An hon. Member has suggested Hindu culture as a third factor but he is mistaken. What he is saying is important in another context and not in that of political unity. It led to cultural unity, which is a different thing entirely. We are talking about political unity at the moment. We have also, it must be admitted, inherited powerful disruptive tendencies. The question is, whether the unifying influence will prove to be stronger than the disruptive forces. I believe that the unifying influence is stronger. The danger is that people, who do not give much thought to this, feel secure in a false sense of unity. They pursue disruptive tendencies till they have gone too far and reach a point where they cannot be checked. That is

why the integration of the minds and hearts of the people of India is vital. That is not a matter the law can settle. The law and the constitution should come in to register the decrees of the mind and the heart. That is the point of view from which the question of Jammu and Kashmir should be approached.

An hon. Member repeatedly said that I had refused to meet the Praja Parishad people and that I treated them as political untouchables. About a year ago I did, as a matter of fact, meet the President of the Praja Parishad, Pandit Premnath Dogra. I met him here in Delhi and had a long talk with him. Of course, the present agitation had not started but there were some minor agitations. We talked of important matters affecting Jammu and Kashmir and it seemed to me that he had accepted my viewpoint and agreed to what I said. I had told him that his method of approach was bad for Jammu and Kashmir State and for Jammu specially and also for the objective he sought to achieve. Two days later, I saw a statement in the press that had been issued by him. To my amazement, it said the opposite of what he had given me to understand. The statement gave the impression that I had accepted his argument. Letters were sent to tell him that it was very wrong of him to have done that. The incident made me feel that he was not a safe person to see often because he would exploit every meeting and I would have to explain each time what had happened. About two months later, he asked to see me and I sent word that our last interview had not been a success, had, in fact, created difficulties and since I was also busy with my duties in Parliament I could not see him. There was no third occasion when such a question had arisen. I should like to read a few lines from the report of a speech delivered in the other House, not by a member of our Party but by a very eminent Member of the Opposition, Acharya Narendra Dev. That, surely, must be an objective analysis because it is by a person who has no desire merely to support the Government. That is what he said:

"The other question, Sir, is the delicate question of Kashmir. I am not competent to pronounce any authoritative opinion on this matter but I will say with a full sense of responsibility that it is a communal

agitation, that the Parishad is the old R.S.S. It opposed the land reform movement. It supported the Maharaja in the days of old and when the R.S.S. was suppressed, it assumed a new name overnight and is masquerading under the name of the Praja Parishad. I say that this agitation is ill-timed, ill-conceived and is calculated to render the greatest injury to our larger interests."

Since I do not wish to be unfair to the House, I will add that subsequently Acharya Narendra Dev went on to say:

".....It has assumed a mass character in that area and we have to find out the actual reasons which have led these masses to be thrown into the net of communalists. I want the communalist leaders to be isolated from the masses. And we should, therefore, try to understand with sympathy the reasons, however wrong they may be, which have led a large number of people to join the communal forces in the country."

The hon. Member referred to the Militia in this connection and said that it consisted mostly of Muslims. As a matter of fact, the total number of the militia in the State is 5,720. The figures are: Muslims—1,859; Hindus—2,763; Buddhists—456; Sikhs—618; Miscellaneous—I do not quite know what 'Miscellaneous' means—24. And what is more, the militia in Jammu is largely Hindu. The fact of the matter is that in the past no Kashmiri, Hindu or Muslim, was allowed to enter the army. The Kashmiris were sensitive to the fact that they were not allowed to enter the army or any semi-armed formations like the constabulary. The old Kashmir army was full of people from Jammu, Hindus and Muslims alike. It is not easy to get a Kashmiri into the militia, for he is not used to it; thus a great difficulty has arisen in the Kashmir Valley.

I do not wish to go into the details of the Praja Parishad movement. I say that mere repression will not do; I also realize that the grievances of the people concerned—I am talking about the large number of people, the masses and when I say grievances, I am referring to economic grievances—must be met. To use the words of Acharya Narendra Dev, these people should be separated from the wrong leadership

that has misled them; but this must be left to them to decide.

It seems to me an extraordinary thing that the agitation of a group in Jammu—a large group, if you like—wants to affect the Constitution of India, wants to do things that will not only affect the State of Jammu and Kashmir but also India and her relations with Pakistan and the United Nations! It is an extraordinary demand that we should be called upon to give assurances about things that will have powerful and far-reaching consequences. This matter was carefully considered by the Government of India and the representatives of the Government of Kashmir and certain agreements were arrived at, which we thought, in the circumstances, good and adequate.

When I am asked questions about the United Nations I am in difficulty. I do not want to go into the question of the right and wrong of actions taken four or five years ago. I do not want to undo anything or withdraw anything that I have said at any time. We have a high reputation and I do not think it does any good to a country to behave in a manner which might discredit it in the slightest degree. We gave our pledge to the United Nations in regard to Kashmir. It is true, if I may say so, that we have not had a very fair deal. Some powerful countries seem to have delighted in putting forward propositions to which we cannot agree. This is probably because the basis of their thought is different. But there it is.

I have taken an enormous amount of time and I am very grateful to this House for the indulgence with which it has listened to me.

ON SCIENCE AND CULTURE

WHAT IS CULTURE ?

I HAVE come here with pleasure, because I have always looked forward to furthering the cause of India's cultural association, not only with the neighbouring countries to the East and West but with the wider world outside. It is not a question of merely wanting such cultural association or considering it good; it is rather a question of the necessity of the situation which is bound to worsen if nothing is done to prevent it. I earnestly hope that the formation of the Indian Council for Cultural Relations will lead to a better understanding between our people and the peoples of other countries.

There is a great deal of confusion in my mind and I shall state quite frankly what it is. All kinds of basic questions crop up from what is going on in the world around us. Nations, individuals and groups talk of understanding one another and it seems an obvious thing that people should try to understand one another and to learn from one another. Yet, when I look through the pages of history or study current events, I sometimes find that people who know one another most, quarrel most. Countries, which are next door to one another in Europe or in Asia, somehow seem to rub one another up the wrong way, though they know one another very thoroughly. Thus knowledge, by itself, does not lead to greater co-operation or friendship. This is not a new thing. Even the long pages of history show that. Has there been something wrong in individual nations or in the approach to this question? Or is it something else that has not worked as it should have done? When we talk of cultural relations, the question that immediately arises in my mind is—what exactly is the 'culture' that people talk so much about?

When I was younger in years, I remember reading about German 'kultur' and of the attempts of the German people to spread it by conquest and other means. There was a big war to spread this 'kultur' and to resist it. Every country and every individual seems to have its peculiar idea of culture. When there is talk about cultural relations—although it is very good in theory—what actually happens is that those peculiar ideas come into conflict and instead of leading to friendship they lead to more estrangement. It is a basic question—what is culture? And I am certainly not competent to give you a definition of it because I have not found one.

One can see each nation and each separate civilization developing its own culture that had its roots in generations hundreds and thousands of years ago. One sees these nations being intimately moulded by the impulse that initially starts a civilization going on its long path. That conception is affected by other conceptions and one sees action and interaction between these varying conceptions. There is, I suppose, no culture in the world which is absolutely pristine, pure and unaffected by any other culture. It simply cannot be, just as nobody can say that he belongs one hundred per cent to a particular racial type, because in the course of hundreds and thousands of years unmistakable changes and mixtures have occurred.

So, culture is bound to get a little mixed up, even though the basic element of a particular national culture remains dominant. If that kind of thing goes on peacefully, there is no harm in it. But it often leads to conflicts. It sometimes leads a group to fear that their culture is being overwhelmed by what they consider to be an outside or alien influence. Then they draw themselves into a shell which isolates them and prevents their thoughts and ideas going out. That is an unhealthy situation, because in any matter and much more so in what might be called a cultural matter, stagnation is the worst possible thing. Culture, if it has any value, must have a certain depth. It must also have a certain dynamic character. After all, culture depends on a vast number of factors. If we leave out what might be called the basic mould

that was given to it in the early stages of a nation's or a people's growth, it is affected by geography, by climate and by all kinds of other factors. The culture of Arabia is intimately governed by the geography and the deserts of Arabia because it grew up there. Obviously, the culture of India in the old days was affected greatly, as we see in our own literature, by the Himalayas, the forests and the great rivers of India among other things. It was a natural growth from the soil. Of the various domains of culture, like architecture, music and literature, any two may mix together, as they often did, and produce a happy combination. But where there is an attempt to improve something or the other which does not naturally grow and mould itself without uprooting itself, conflict inevitably arises. Then also comes something which to my mind is basically opposed to all ideas of culture. And that is the isolation of the mind and the deliberate shutting up of the mind to other influences. My own view of India's history is that we can almost measure the growth and the advance of India and the decline of India by relating them to periods when India had her mind open to the outside world and when she wanted to close it up. The more she closed it up, the more static she became. Life, whether of the individual, group, nation or society, is essentially a dynamic, changing, growing thing. Whatever stops that dynamic growth also injures it and undermines it.

We have had great religions and they have had an enormous effect on humanity. Yet, if I may say so with all respect and without meaning any ill to any person, those very religions, in the measure that they made the mind of man static, dogmatic and bigoted, have had, to my mind, an evil effect. The things they said may be good but when it is claimed that the last word has been said, society becomes static.

The individual human being or race or nation must necessarily have a certain depth and certain roots somewhere. They do not count for much unless they have roots in the past, which past is after all the accumulation of generations of experience and some type of wisdom. It is essential that you have that. Otherwise you become just pale copies of

something which has no real meaning to you as an individual or as a group. On the other hand, one cannot live in roots alone. Even roots wither unless they come out in the sun and the free air. Only then can the roots give you sustenance. Only then can there be a branching out and a flowering. How, then, are you to balance these two essential factors? It is very difficult, because some people think a great deal about the flowers and the leaves on the branches, forgetting that they only flourish because there is a stout root to sustain them. Others think so much of the roots that no flowers or leaves or branches are left; there is only a thick stem somewhere. So, the question is how one is to achieve a balance.

Does culture mean some inner growth in the man? Of course, it must. Does it mean the way he behaves to others? Certainly it must. Does it mean the capacity to understand the other person? I suppose so. Does it mean the capacity to make yourself understood by the other person? I suppose so. It means all that. A person who cannot understand another's viewpoint is to that extent limited in mind and culture, because nobody, perhaps, barring some very extraordinary human beings, can presume to have the fullest knowledge and wisdom. The other party or the other group may also have some inkling of knowledge or wisdom or truth and if we shut our minds to that then we not only deprive ourselves of it but we cultivate an attitude of mind which, I would say, is opposed to that of a cultured man. The cultured mind, rooted in itself, should have its doors and windows open. It should have the capacity to understand the other's viewpoint fully even though it cannot always agree with it. The question of agreement or disagreement only arises when you understand a thing. Otherwise, it is blind negation which is not a cultured approach to any question.

I should like to use another word—science. What is a scientific approach to life's problems? I suppose it is one of examining everything, of seeking truth by trial and error and by experiment, of never saying that this must be so but trying to understand why it is so and, if one is convinced of it, of accepting it, of having the capacity to change one's notions the moment some other proof is forthcoming, of having an

open mind, which tries to imbibe the truth wherever it is found. If that is culture, how far is it represented in the modern world and in the nations of today? Obviously, if it was represented more than it is, many of our problems, national and international, would be far easier to solve.

Almost every country in the world believes that it has some special dispensation from Providence, that it is of the chosen people or race and that others, whether they are good or bad, are somewhat inferior creatures. It is extraordinary how this kind of feeling persists in all nations of the East as well as of the West without exception. The nations of the East are strongly entrenched in their own ideas and convictions and sometimes in their own sense of superiority about certain matters. Anyhow, in the course of the last two or three hundred years, they have received many knocks on the head and they have been humiliated, they have been debased and they have been exploited. And so, in spite of their feeling that they were superior in many ways, they were forced to admit that they could be knocked about and exploited. To some extent, this brought a sense of realism to them. There was also an attempt to escape from reality by saying that it was sad that we were not so advanced in material and technical things but that these were after all superficial things; nevertheless, we were superior in essential things, in spiritual things, in moral values. I have no doubt that spiritual things and moral values are ultimately more important than other things but the way one finds escape in the thought that one is spiritually superior, simply because one is inferior in a material and physical sense, is surprising. It does not follow by any means. It is an escape from facing up to the causes of one's degradation.

Nationalism, of course, is a curious phenomenon which at a certain stage in a country's history gives life, growth, strength and unity but, at the same time, it has a tendency to limit one, because one thinks of one's country as something different from the rest of the world. The perspective changes and one is continuously thinking of one's own struggles and virtues and failings to the exclusion of other thoughts. The result is that the same nationalism, which is the symbol of

growth for a people, becomes a symbol of the cessation of that growth in the mind. Nationalism, when it becomes successful, sometimes goes on spreading in an aggressive way and becomes a danger internationally. Whatever line of thought you follow, you arrive at the conclusion that some kind of balance must be found. Otherwise something that was good can turn into evil. Culture, which is essentially good, becomes not only static but aggressive and something that breeds conflict and hatred when looked at from a wrong point of view. How you are to find a balance, I do not know. Apart from the political and economic problems of the age, perhaps, that is the greatest problem today, because behind it there is a tremendous conflict in the spirit of man and a tremendous search for something which it cannot find. We turn to economic theories because they have an undoubted importance. It is folly to talk of culture or even of God when human beings starve and die. Before one can talk about anything else one must provide the normal essentials of life to human beings. That is where economics comes in. Human beings today are not in the mood to tolerate this suffering and starvation and inequality when they see that the burden is not equally shared. Others profit while they only bear the burden.

We have inevitably to deal with these problems in economic and other ways but I do think that behind it all there is a tremendous psychological problem in the minds of the people. It may be that some people think about it consciously and deliberately and others rather unconsciously and dimly but that this conflict exists in the spirit of man today is certain. How it will be resolved, I do not know. One thing that troubles me is this: people who understand one another more and more begin often enough to quarrel more and more. Nevertheless, it does not follow from this that we should not try to understand one another. That would amount to limiting oneself completely and that is something which really cannot be done in the context of the modern world. Therefore, it becomes essential that we try to understand one another in the right way. The right way is important. The right approach, the friendly approach, is

important, because a friendly approach brings a friendly response. I have not the shadow of a doubt that it is a fundamental rule of human life that, if the approach is good, the response is good. If the approach is bad, the response is likely to be bad, too. So, if we approach our fellow human beings or countries in a friendly way, with our minds and hearts open and prepared to accept whatever good comes to them—and that does not mean surrendering something that we consider of essential value to truth or to our own genius—then we shall be led not only towards understanding but the right type of understanding.

So, I shall leave you to determine what culture and wisdom really are. We grow in learning, in knowledge and in experience, till we have such an enormous accumulation of them that it becomes impossible to know exactly where we stand. We are overwhelmed by all this and, at the same time, somehow or other we have a feeling that all these put together do not necessarily represent a growth in the wisdom of the human race. I have a feeling that perhaps some people who did not have all the advantages of modern life and modern science were essentially wiser than most of us are. Whether or not we shall be able in later times to combine all this knowledge, scientific growth and betterment of the human species with true wisdom, I do not know. It is a race between various forces. I am reminded of the saying of a very wise man who was a famous Greek poet:

What else is Wisdom? What of man's endeavour or
 God's high grace, so lovely and so great?
 To stand from fear set free, to breathe and wait,
 To hold a hand uplifted over Hate,
 And shall not Loveliness be loved for ever?

THE SPIRIT OF SCIENCE

IN THE course of less than four months, we have put up, declared open or are going to declare open three national laboratories. I suppose before this year is out some more

Speech at the opening ceremony of the Fuel Research Institute, Digwadih, April 22, 1950

national laboratories will also be started. This is a great venture testifying to the faith which our scientists and, I hope, our Government have in science. I suppose the putting up of fine and attractive buildings does some service to science; nevertheless, buildings do not make science as Dr Raman has often reminded us. It is human beings who make science, not bricks and mortar. Properly equipped buildings, however, help the human being to work efficiently. It is, therefore, desirable to have these fine laboratories for trained persons to work in and for persons to be trained for future work.

You, Sir, referred to the spirit of science. I wonder what exactly that spirit is and to what extent we agree or differ in our ideas of it. Is science, as is often supposed, a handmaiden to industry? It certainly wants to help industry, though not merely for the sake of helping industry but also because it wants to create work for the nation, so that people may have better living conditions and greater opportunities for growth. That I suppose will be agreed to but there is something more to it. What ultimately does science represent?

You, Sir, just referred to scientists declaring war on nature. May I put it in a different way? We seek the co-operation of nature, we seek to uncover the secrets of nature, to understand them and to utilize them for the benefit of humanity. The active principle of science is discovery. Now, what is, if I may ask, the active principle of a social framework or society? Usually, it stands for conservatism, remaining where we are, not changing and carrying on, though, of course, with some improvement and further additions. Nevertheless, it is a principle of continuity rather than of change. So, we come up against a certain inherent conflict in society between the co-existing principles of continuity and of conservatism and the scientific principle of discovery which brings about change and challenges that continuity. So the scientific worker, although he is praised and patted on the back, is, nevertheless, not wholly approved of, because he comes and upsets the status quo of things. Normally speaking, science seldom really has the facilities that it deserves except when some misfortune comes to a country in the shape of war. Then everything has to be set

aside and science has its way, even though it is for an evil purpose.

It is interesting to see this conflict between the normal conservatism of a static society and the normal revolutionary tendency of the scientist's discovery which often changes the basis of that society. It changes living conditions and the conditions that govern human life and human survival.

I take it that most people who talk glibly of science, including our great industrialists, think of science merely as a kind of handmaiden to make their work easier. And so it is. Of course, it does make their work easier. It adds to the wealth of the nation and betters conditions. All this science does do. But surely science is something more than that. The history of science shows that it does not simply better the old. It sometimes upsets the old. It does not merely add new truths to the old ones but sometimes the new truth it discovers disintegrates some part of the old truths and thereby upsets the way of men's thinking and the way of their lives. Science, therefore, does not merely repeat the old in better ways or add to the old but creates something that is new to the world and to human consciousness.

If we pursue this line of thought, what exactly does the spirit of science mean? It means many things. It means not only accepting the fresh truth that science may bring, not only improving the old but being prepared to upset the old if it goes against that spirit. It also means not being tied down to something that is old because it is old, because we have carried on with it but being able to accept its disintegration; it means not being tied down to a social fabric or an industrial fabric or an economic fabric if it goes against the new discovery.

Whatever they may say, most countries normally do not like to change. The human being is essentially a conservative animal. He is used to certain ways of life and any one trying to change them meets with his disapproval. Nevertheless, change comes and people have to adapt themselves to it; they have done so in the past. All countries, as I said, are normally conservative. But I imagine that our country is more than normally conservative. It is for this reason that I venture to

place these thoughts before you. I find a curious hiatus in people's thinking. I find it even in the thinking of scientists who praise science and practise it in the laboratory but discard the ways of science, its method of approach and the spirit of science in everything else they do in life. They become completely unscientific. If we approach science in the proper way, it does some good and there is no doubt that it will always do some good. It teaches us new ways of doing things. Perhaps, it improves our conditions of industrial life but the basic thing that science should do is to teach us to think straight, to act straight and not to be afraid of discarding anything or of accepting anything, provided there are sufficient reasons for doing so. I should like our country to understand and appreciate that idea all the more, because in the realm of thought our country in the past has, in a sense, been singularly free and it has not hesitated to look down the deep well of truth whatever it might contain. Nevertheless, in spite of such a free mind, our country encumbered itself to such an extent in matters of social practice that its growth was hindered and is hindered in a hundred ways even today. Our customs are just ways of looking at little things that govern our lives and have no significant meaning. Even then, these customs come in our way. Now that we have attained independence, there is naturally a resurgence of all kinds of new forces, both good and bad; good forces are, of course, liberated by a sense of freedom but along with them there are also a number of forces which, under the guise of what people call culture, narrow our minds and our outlook. These forces are essentially a restriction and denial of any real kind of culture. Culture is the widening of the mind and of the spirit. It is never a narrowing of the mind or a restriction of the human spirit or of the country's spirit. Therefore, if we look at science in the real way and if we think of these research institutes and laboratories in a fundamental sense, then they are something more than just little ways of improving things and of finding out how this or that should be done. Of course, we have to do that, too. But these institutes must gradually affect our minds, not only the minds of the young men and young women who would work here but also the minds of

others, more specially the minds of the rising generation, so that the nation may imbibe the spirit of science and be prepared to accept the new truth, even though it has to discard something of the old. Only then will this approach to science bear true fruit. It is because we attach importance to these research institutes that we have ventured to ask you, Sir, Mr President, to take the trouble to come all the way here to open this third of our great national laboratories and we are very grateful to you that you have taken the trouble to do so. I am sure that your visit here and the visits of the many distinguished scientists will prove a blessing to this institute. Besides, it will help to draw people's attention not only to the external applications and implications of science but to its real value which lies in widening the spirit of man and thereby bettering humanity at large.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

YOUR Highness, I should just like to say how happy I am to be present at the inauguration of the Science Congress. As Your Highness has said, I made rather special efforts to be here as I shall be leaving for England in a few hours. I want to tell you that certain changes have recently taken place in the Central Government. Perhaps, you know that a new Ministry called the Ministry of Natural Resources and Scientific Research has been formed. I hope this will be welcomed by this Congress and by the eminent scientists who are present on this occasion.

Ever since my association with the Government began, I have felt the need for encouraging scientific work and research and have, for that purpose, concerned myself with important organizations like the Board of Scientific and Industrial Research of which I am Chairman. I have also been closely associated with the Atomic Energy Commission. That does not mean that I know very much about science or atomic

energy. But I felt and it was agreed that it would be helpful if I were sometimes to play the part of a show boy. My association, therefore, did help these organizations in their dealings with the Government. I have also been, during these past three years, Minister in charge of Scientific Research. Now that the new Ministry of Natural Resources and Scientific Research has been formed, it will, of course, include the Department of Scientific Research as also many other important departments. My very old friend and colleague, Sri Sri Prakasa, will be in charge of its activities. That does not mean that I shall cease to be in charge of anything. If I may say so, with all respect to my colleagues, my over-all charge in a sense continues as far as scientific work is concerned and I propose to take a deep interest in it.

My interest largely consists in trying to make the Indian people and even the Government of India conscious of scientific work and the necessity for it. The work is not really done by me but by my eminent colleagues here who have helped to give such a great place to science in India. I wish to assure you that, as far as I am concerned, I shall help in every way the progress of scientific research and the application of science to our problems in India.

Dr Bhatnagar has been very intimately connected with all this work as Secretary of the Department of Scientific Research. He will now continue that association in a larger field and I am quite sure that this will be of great benefit to science. I am particularly happy to be here today because this session of the Science Congress is going to be presided over by my dear friend and colleague, Dr Bhabha. It is not for me to tell you of his achievements and plans, which are both great. It has been a great pleasure for me to work with him in various ways and more especially in the Atomic Energy Commission.

I now proceed to inaugurate the 38th session of the Indian Science Congress and the first session of the Pan-Indian Ocean Science Congress.

THE CRISIS OF MAN

MR CHAIRMAN, Mr Director-General, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, almost exactly two years ago, in this very hall, I had the privilege of inaugurating the first session of the Indian National Commission of UNESCO. Now we meet here again and I am called upon to undertake the same duty. I do so with great pleasure and consider it an honour and a privilege that you have associated me with others in your work. On behalf of the Government of India, I should like to welcome all those eminent men and women of learning and goodwill who have assembled here from various parts of the world. I should like more specially to welcome you, Sir, Mr Director-General, who have graced this occasion with your presence. As our distinguished Chairman said just now, we were looking forward to having you in our midst, to confer with you, to learn from you what we should do and, perhaps, to make some suggestions to you and tell you what we have in our minds. You are welcome because you are the head of a great organization which holds out promise for the future and which has already substantial achievement to its credit. You are also welcome, Sir, if I may say so, as the representative of a country which, though very far away from us, seems strangely akin to us in many ways. When we look towards that country, we see friendly eyes and a spirit of understanding and comradeship. You have played a distinguished role in that country and as such also we welcome you. May I say that, as Foreign Minister of our country, it has been a great pleasure for me to have helped recently in the exchange of Ambassadors between your country and ours? I hope this will bring closer understanding and co-operation between us.

In inaugurating this conference, I do not quite know what you all expect me to say. I have been asked to come here and address you almost in my official capacity as Prime Minister; and I suppose I cannot easily get away from it. But I am something other than a Prime Minister too. I am also a

human being. I hope Prime Ministers are also normally, if not always, human beings. I often find myself struggling for some light, for a vision of what one should do, for a glimpse of the truth and of the pathway to the truth. You feel and I feel that it is unbecoming for a Prime Minister to confess to these struggles and conflicts, because a Prime Minister must be sure, be of set purpose and should know exactly what he should do and how he should do it. But forgetting for the moment that I happen to be the Prime Minister of this great country, I want for a few minutes to address you as friends in a common quest and to share with you some of my own difficulties, because I feel that those difficulties are present not only in my mind but in your minds also and possibly in minds of innumerable human beings all over the world.

UNESCO represents a great ideal. You read through its objects, its Charter or the speeches that are made on various occasions. You see a list of what it has done and what it seeks to do. Most of you may criticize something here and there but you will agree that it essentially represents a great ideal to which every person of goodwill, who wants this world to progress along right lines, must necessarily subscribe.

While you discuss different phases of activity in your different sections, a doubt arises in my mind and it is this: how far are our different forms of activity meeting what might be called the essential crisis within? That crisis may be represented in many ways but essentially it is a crisis of the spirit of man. We all suffer from it, provided we are sensitive enough to what is happening around us.

Here, in India, many of us grew up under two great traditions—I may say, India grew up under two great traditions—embodied in two mighty men, Gandhi and Tagore. These two men gave birth to India as she is today. We are their children in thought—very imperfect, very foolish children but their children, nevertheless. Both of them, though vastly different, sprang from the soil and culture of India and are rooted in the ten thousand year old Indian tradition—both so different but both reminding us of the innumerable facets of India. Both were typically Indian, both so different and yet so alike. They represented

the ideal of young India—the ideal which I had in my young days and which possibly many people still have. And yet I find that those two men somehow seem very distant now. Though we speak of them very often, we have fallen into different ways of thinking and taken to other ideals. Instead of that mighty spirit of creative effort and faith and hope, which those men in their own different ways represented in the modern age, India as also other countries, begin to represent more and more a spirit of denial and destruction. If that is the spirit of the modern age, what will your activities in your various sections, schools, seminars, conferences and congresses be worth? What will they be worth if some dark cloud were to hover above you and envelop you at any time? This is very likely. I remember the meeting of the League of Nations in Geneva in the year 1938. There were innumerable other organs of the League of Nations also meeting there. At that time, Europe was shaken by the fear of war. There were war clouds in the Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia and all kinds of threats and ultimatums were in the air; people rushed from London or from Paris to this place or that. At that time, in Geneva, I found these commissions and committees working calmly as if they were oblivious of everything else. They could not, of course, stop what was happening and a year later the committees, the commissions and the League of Nations itself were all overwhelmed by events which they could not understand or control. I wondered then how a great organization like the League of Nations, after twenty years or more of very good work indeed, had been swept away by something which it could not control.

And so, a fear creeps into my mind: are all our labours possibly going to be swept away by something totally beyond our control? If so, is it not more desirable to control that something or try to control it, rather than try and live in an ivory tower, doing good work, no doubt, but doing work which somehow does not touch the essence of things? That is one of the difficulties that confronts me.

We have suddenly emerged into a new age. Of course, every age is a new age but, I suppose, it is correct to say that

this age of ours is especially so; and the symbol of the age is the atom bomb or atomic energy, if you like, but it is well to remember that today atomic energy is thought of in terms of atom bombs only. And if the atom bomb is the symbol of this age, then everything is conditioned by that symbol—man's thinking, man's fears and everything else.

We seem to live under this shadow. Are we, with the very proud and magnificent edifice of our civilization, nearing the afternoon or evening of this civilization? Have we lost the creative spirit? Have we lost the energy and faith that go with the dawn of civilizations? Can we recapture that spirit of the dawn in this afternoon and convert it into something other than what it is today or is it inevitable that the afternoon will be followed by the evening and then by the shades of night? I do not know but my mind struggles with this problem. It also struggles with the smaller problems of the day, for we cannot ignore them. The problem of our civilization, however, is the major question mark of the day. How are we to meet these problems? UNESCO says, by education, science and culture. Of course. How else? And yet we find that education, as our distinguished Chairman has just told us, has been leading us into wrong channels. We find science perverted to serve evil ends. We find that culture, instead of being something that broadens our vision and gives us wisdom, sometimes actually narrows us and engenders wars. It is not culture but the slogan of culture that is used anyhow and each person who uses it means something quite different by it. Thus, the very things that ought to help us in solving the world's problems, namely, education, science and culture, become barriers to that solution. How are we to get over these difficulties? Surely, not by denying them or by saying that education, science and culture are no good. Certainly not, because, after all, they are the only available means for us to forge ahead, understand and solve these problems. Therefore, we have to adhere to them and yet, while adhering, we have to realize that these words often become debased in our mouths and in our activities, more especially in the field of politics, where every noble word or sentiment man has ever invented or thought of becomes

base coin. UNESCO, I understand, is carrying on, here in India and possibly elsewhere, investigations into what is called the problem of tensions. They study all kinds of tensions; tensions between capital and labour, tensions between communities, between groups and so many other tensions, of which the world is full today. I wonder if it would not be a worthy exercise for UNESCO to study them at Lake Success. Why not study them at the UN headquarters? Why not study them in the various Chancelleries of the world, since they are the root cause of the tensions of the world today and not those people who occasionally might, in a fit of excitement, break a few heads. They are fortunately few but those who sit in the Chancelleries are preparing to break millions and billions of heads. How then are we going to stop that? Surely not by studying the petty problems of the market place or of some obscure corners of the world, when this major problem overshadows the world. I am placing before you in all humility the problems that confront me. I may tell you that when I think of these problems, all pride of intellect goes, because I have seen intellect prostituted to base ends. Sometimes, intellect by itself leads to nothing. All pride of achievement fades because of this tremendous lack of achievement that stares us in the face today. I do not know what remains in its place. Perhaps, some pride must remain, because, as long as there is strength, one must have some pride in doing one's duty, whatever the achievements might be. Apart from the personal equation, the big question does stare us in the face. How are we, however and wheresoever situated, to meet this great problem in this atomic age of ours? We find people, nations and statesmen talking in terms of the greatest certitude about their being right and about their undertaking some moral crusade or other for the benefit of mankind. Sometimes, I feel that the world may be better off if there were fewer of these modern crusaders about. Everyone wants not only to carry on a moral crusade in his own environment but to impose his moral crusade upon another. When moralities or the objectives of the moral crusades differ, conflict inevitably comes. The fact of the matter is that in theory there is and there ought to be a

great deal in common between what is considered culture and truth. Nevertheless, the world is a place with much variety. The great nations of the world have very different backgrounds; their historical development has been different; even their wants are different today. In a great part of contemporary Asia, the primary wants are food, clothing, housing and tolerably healthy conditions of living. You cannot expect any high flights of culture where the primary needs of mankind are not satisfied. People necessarily think of these primary needs in a great part of Asia. Other countries think differently, because of their different needs and different backgrounds. In a country like India, we cannot forget the great and glorious past we have had and there is no reason why we should forget that past. We try to get rid of the burden of that past where it is wrong or out of place to remember it. Our roots, however, must necessarily belong to that past. The first thing to remember is that, while the world is inevitably developing common ways of action and thinking—because this has become essential—, inevitably also there are going to be differences which we must recognize and allow full play, without trying to impose our will on others in order to obliterate those differences. I would apply this test even to a country like India and much more so when we talk of the whole world. Many countries seem to think that it is their duty to make others like themselves.

This is essentially an age of science and technological development. This technological development goes ahead with an ever increasing tempo and it will no doubt affect the lives of men and, perhaps, may end up in their deaths. In many ways, it results in a tremendous advance and we can say with assurance that many of the problems of past history, namely, those of food, clothing, housing and health services and all that a human being requires, are capable of solution today. There is enough in the world for all and more. Therefore, the old cause of conflict no longer exists. Yet, something is lacking. The fact is that this technological age has brought greater conflicts in its train in spite of its promise of putting an end to conflicts. This again is a great contradiction, for notwithstanding the continuous talk of peaceful progress,

co-operation and mutual understanding among nations, we move in contrary directions. Our knowing one another more, instead of making each of us understand and appreciate the other, often brings dislike of the other. How can we get over these contradictions? I take it that the problem of UNESCO is essentially this: how to get over difficulties in order to realize its ideals? How to utilize education, science and culture in the right way and prevent its exploitation for wrong ends? I think that these efforts will not bring success, unless somehow or other they can affect this other major factor which seems to hang over world affairs today. How it can be done, I do not know.

We live in a period of tremendous potential conflict and every nation begins to think more and more in terms of survival. When people think in terms of survival, it means that they are conditioned by great fear and when the desire for survival asserts itself, then logical thinking and the reasoning faculties do not even function. Human beings forget their humanity, because they are just fighting to escape some dreadful terror, struggling to survive and they do not care what happens or what they do in order to survive. This applies to individuals as well as nations. This struggle for survival, which brings out the worst in humanity, is a dreadful prospect. If humanity continues to think in terms of encompassing fear and of mere survival, then fear itself will inevitably bring out all inhuman instincts. When the real struggle for survival comes, few may survive and, possibly, those who survive will not be human.

You will forgive me if I have taken you somewhat outside your normal realm of activity and thought but I have felt that unless we think of the problem in the context of this broader outlook and vision, perhaps, we will be caught in narrow grooves of thought and not progress further.

ON MUSEUMS

I AM grateful to you for inviting me to inaugurate this *Centenary Celebration* because I am deeply interested in museums in my own layman's way. I am not an expert in anything but I have dabbled in a large number of activities. I am interested in many things and am even interested in experts, though from a distance. It is obvious that experts have their use but they often think that they function only in a world of experts, with the result that they somehow lose touch with the common man or the layman who is not an expert. I merely mention this, because I feel that experts exist in some upper sphere unconnected with humanity at large and very few persons even find their way there except, as I said, experts.

Now, museums I think are very necessary from a variety of points of view and some of the most exhilarating times that I have spent have been in museums—not in this country but chiefly in Europe—and I have always been sorry that I could not spend more time there. What exactly a museum is and what purpose it serves are questions which can be answered in many ways. I suppose it is some kind of congealed history or a bit of the past locked up in your cabinets and placed so that you may have a glimpse of it. It is a place where you collect beautiful objects and it is good to have beautiful objects for people to look at. More and more people seem to lose all idea of what beauty is and to surround themselves with articles which certainly are not beautiful, whatever else they may be. It is quite extraordinary how people are losing any real appreciation of beauty. What is the reason? I am not talking of India only but of many other countries, too; whether it is symptomatic of the modern age or not, I do not know; but the fact remains that we are becoming more and more shoddy. What is worse, however, is that we sometimes seem to take pride in this fact. Therefore, it is desirable to collect articles of beauty. Even in a matter like children's toys, may I ask why they should be given horrible golliwogs

as presents? I do not know. No doubt, children are interested in animals and they should have them. Why not have beautiful things and why not train them in the appreciation of beauty from their childhood instead of giving them toys which are caricatures of what they see? Such toys no doubt excite their curiosity but, at the same time, make them insensitive to beauty. Because of this tendency, which appears to me to be growing throughout the world, because of this lack of appreciation of any kind of beauty, it is desirable to collect articles of beauty from the past and the present so that we may at least have some standard to judge by and so that the people who come to the museums may see for a while articles of beauty, even though they may not generally see them in their daily lives.

There is another aspect of the museum which I called congealed history. Do people go there just to see odd things oddly displayed, just to see, as an oddity, something that existed five hundred or a thousand years ago or do they go to see something that might have significance for them even today? I do not know how history is taught because, at college, I hardly learnt history in the normal way. I read it myself and, therefore, my reading was not guided by experts at all. It was casual, though widespread, reading and I was fascinated by it. My fascination for history was not in reading about odd events that happened in the past but rather in its relation to the things that led up to the present. Only then did it become alive to me. Otherwise it would have been an odd thing unconnected with my life or the world. It must somehow be connected in a series—something of the past leading to something else and that something else leading to the present. Then alone can history live for us.

Let us apply that to the museum. A museum which is really meant to interest and educate must be something which connects its objects with the things the visitors are used to seeing in their lives and in their environments. It should not be just a symbol of the distant, unconnected past. I do not know how far our experts think on these lines and prepare their museums on these lines. It is not the normal antiquarian's view of things. An antiquarian is necessary, of

course, to collect these antiquities but an antiquarian who himself becomes an antique piece is not much good. He must have some relation to the modern world. Then only can we make antiquity a living reality in terms of the modern world. Forgive me for these personal reflections. It seems to me incorrect for us to treat any period of the past as something cut off from subsequent periods or from the present and if I look at it that way it does not interest me much. If there is the slightest connection between that and my present-day thoughts and activities it is a blessing and a matter of interest to me. I am giving these rather personal reactions, because I think it might interest some of you, gentlemen, especially those connected with museums. If I may say so with all humility, the greatest danger in the world is that people, in their zeal to specialize, lose all perspective. They become specialists at a particular job and very fine specialists at that but they lose the larger view of things and, therefore, perhaps they may be said to be only specialists and nothing more. Some of you may know these lines from Wordsworth:

A primrose by a river's brim,
A yellow primrose was to him
And it was nothing more.

They bring to mind the botanist who studies the Latin names of flowers but loses all sense of the beauty of flowers. In other words, we become experts in something but lack wisdom in everything else. In our world, which is so learned in so many subjects, there is very little wisdom. Perhaps, that is because we all know something about a very little part of life and very little about the larger scheme of things.

Now, coming back to the museum, it is a collection of all kinds of things of beauty or things of utility from the past and present and should convey to us some idea of the larger scheme of life. It should ultimately lead to or at least help in an understanding of the present scheme of things. I like the museums of antiquity but there is another type of museum which perhaps the antiquarians consider to be of a lower species. That is the type which may be represented by, let us say, Deutsches Museum of Munich and some other museums in Paris and London, where one can see modern

life, modern activity, the growth of science from the pre-scientific period. Such museums are fascinating and contain more education than years of courses in college or university. They also represent something I should like to see grow as part of general education and school or college education.

Lastly, the whole point of museums, whether they be museums of antiquity or museums of modern life, is that larger and larger numbers of people should visit them and learn from them. They should not be confined to the visiting Directors of Museums from other countries. More and more people should come and learn and, in fact, facilities for learning should be provided. That is to say, some arrangement should be made for lectures to be given to ordinary folk who come there and for guides to explain to them what these things are and arouse their interest in them, especially school children and college boys and girls. That is the main purpose of museums. I would not very much mind if no adult came to the museums, because his mind is made up and is not always capable of learning much; but in the formative period of childhood and youth, it is essential that people should come to museums and learn. Their minds will be affected by the objects which they see there. I should like this aspect of education through the museums to be developed, not by appeals to the public but by encouraging and inviting people to come, inviting not only the people who would normally come but also those who would not otherwise come, persuading them to bring their children and explaining things to them so that they may widen their vision and feel that the world is a bigger thing than they normally believed it to be. As I grow old, I tend to philosophize and dole out advice to others. But I am happy to be here to participate in the Centenary Celebration of the oldest of India's museums. I hope it will flourish and expand and, if I may say so, expand in the direction that I have indicated.

THE CONCEPT OF MAN

I AM grateful to you for this opportunity of attending the last session of this Symposium. I must apologize for not having attended the opening session to welcome you all here. I looked forward to it greatly, not merely to perform the formal function of opening but rather, as the President suggested, to participate in some way in your discussions and talks and to try and gather some light from those discussions. I was greatly disappointed that I could not do so. It is good of you to ask me to speak but I feel somewhat hesitant because of the presence of very eminent friends who have come from distant countries. There are specialists and men and women of great experience; and for me to say something about the great subject of your debate appears rather presumptuous to me. If I had the chance and the occasion to attend some of your sessions, I would have listened to what was said, perhaps, sometimes participated or put a question but mostly listened. I would have listened, because I have been anxious to find out what you had in your mind and to find out how that would help me to understand for myself some of the problems that confront us. Most of us, I suppose, are burdened with the complexity of our present-day problems. We live our day to day lives and face our day to day difficulties but somehow that is not enough. One seeks something behind that daily round and tries to find out how one can solve the problems that affect the world. For one whom circumstances have placed in a position of great responsibility, it is particularly difficult to avoid thinking about these problems. During the last few weeks I have been going about this great country and seeing multitudes of human beings, surging masses of my countrymen and countrywomen. I have thus invariably thought of what was going to happen to these people, what they were thinking and in which direction they were going. These questions apply to us also because we are in the same boat. And then I think of the multitudes in other countries. What about those vast masses of human beings? Some of us here are functioning on the political plane and presuming to

decide the fate of nations. How far do our decisions affect these multitudes? Do we think of them or do we live in some upper stratosphere of diplomats and politicians and the like, exchanging notes and sometimes using harsh words against one another? In the context of this mighty world, its vast masses of human beings and the tremendous phase of transition through which we are passing, politics becomes rather trivial. I have no particular light to throw on the problems that you have been discussing; rather I would like to put some of the difficulties that I have in my mind before you and I hope that when I have occasion to read some of the reports of what you have been saying to each other, perhaps, those addresses might help me to understand the methods of solving some of these problems.

Now, one of my chief difficulties is this: somehow it seems to me that the modern world is getting completely out of tune with what I might call the life of the mind—I am leaving out the life of the spirit at the moment. Yet, the modern world is entirely the outcome of the life of the mind. After all, it is the human mind that has produced everything that we see around us and feel around us. Civilization is the product of the human mind and yet, strangely enough, one begins to feel that the function of the mind becomes less and less important in the modern world or, at any rate, is no longer so important as it used to be. The mind may count for a great deal in specialized domains; it does and so we make great progress in those specialized domains of life but, generally speaking, the mind as a whole counts for less and less. That is my impression. If it is a correct impression, then there is something radically wrong with the civilization that we are building or have built. The changes that are so rapidly taking place emphasize other aspects of life and somehow prevent the mind from functioning as it should and as perhaps it used to do in the earlier periods of the world's history. If that is true, then surely it is not a good outlook for the world, because the very basis on which our civilization has grown, on which man has risen step by step to the great heights on which he stands today, the very foundation of that edifice, is shaken.

In India we are more particularly concerned about the primary necessities of life for our people. We are concerned with food for our people, with clothing, shelter and housing for our people, with education, health and so on. Unless you have these primary necessities, it seems futile to me to talk about the life of the mind or the life of the spirit. You cannot talk of God to a starving person; you must give him food. One must deal with these primary necessities, it is true. Nevertheless, even in dealing with them one has to have some kind of ideal or objective in view. If that ideal or objective somehow becomes less and less connected with the growth of the human mind, then there must be something wrong. I do not know if what I say is true or whether you agree with it and I do not know, even if it is true, what can be done to improve it.

I am, if I may say so, a great admirer of the achievements of modern civilization, of the growth of and applications of science and of technological growth. Humanity has every reason to be proud of them and yet if these achievements lessen the capacity for future growth—and that will happen if the mind deteriorates—then surely there is something wrong about this process. It is obvious that ultimately the mind should dominate. I am not mentioning the spirit again but that comes into the picture, too. If the world suffers from mental deterioration or from moral degradation, then something goes wrong at the very root of civilization or culture. Even though that civilization may drag out for a considerable period, it grows less and less vital and ultimately tumbles down. When I look back on the periods of past history, I find certain periods very outstanding. They show great achievements of the human mind, while some others do not. One finds races achieving a high level and then apparently fading away—at least fading away from the point of view of their achievements. And so I wonder whether something that led to the fading away of relatively high cultures is not happening today and producing an inner weakness in the structure of our modern civilization.

Then the question arises in my mind as to which environment is likely to produce the best type of human being.

You talk about education and that obviously is very important. But apart from school or college education, the entire environment that surrounds us naturally affects the development of the human being. What kind of environment has produced these great ages of history? Are we going towards that environment or going away from it, in spite of the great progress that we have made in many departments of human life? The Industrial Revolution that started about 200 years ago brought about enormous changes, largely for the good. That process, I take it, is continuing and the tempo of change becomes faster and faster. Where is it leading us to? It has led us in one direction towards great conflicts and possibly greater conflicts are in store for us which threaten to engulf a large part of humanity in a common cataclysm.

There is an essential contradiction in this race between progress and building up on the one hand and this element on the other, which is likely to destroy all that we have built up. Most of us seem to live as if both are inevitable and have to be put up with. It is very odd that we wish to build and build and build and at the same time look forward to the possible destruction of all that we build. The destruction may externally be through war but what is perhaps more dangerous is the inner destruction of the mind and spirit, after which the destruction of the outer emblems of the mind and spirit may follow. Is it, I wonder, some resultant of the growth of the Industrial Revolution that is over-reaching itself? Have we lost touch with the roots that give strength to a race, humanity or the individual just as a city dweller, perhaps, loses touch with the soil and sometimes even with the sun, living an artificial life in comfort and even in luxury? He lacks something that is vital to the human being. So whole races begin more and more to live an artificial life, cut off, if I may say so, from the soil and the sun. Is that not so? These ideas trouble me. This growth of a mechanical civilization, which has obviously brought great triumphs and helped the world so much, gradually affects the man and the mind. The mind which produced the machine to help itself gradually becomes a slave of that

machine and we progressively become a mechanically minded race.

I suppose the vitality of a group, an individual or a society is measured by the extent to which it possesses courage and, above all, creative imagination. If that creative imagination is lacking, our growth becomes more and more stunted, which is a sign of decay. What then is happening today? Are we trying to improve in this respect or are we merely functioning somewhere on the surface without touching the reality which is afflicting the world and which may result in political conflict, in economic warfare or in world war?

So, when there are discussions on the concept of man as visualized in the Eastern ideal or the Western ideal, they interest me greatly from a historical point of view and from a cultural point of view, although I have always resisted this idea of dividing the world into the Orient and the Occident. I do not believe in such divisions. There have, of course, been differences in racial and national outlook and in ideals but to talk of the East and the West as such has little meaning. The modern West, meaning thereby a great part of Europe and the Americas, has, more especially during the last 200 years or so, developed a particular type of civilization which is based on certain traditions derived from Greece and Rome. It is, however, the tremendous industrial growth that has made the West what it is. I can see the difference between an industrialized and a non-industrialized country. I think the difference, say between India and Europe in the Middle Ages, would not have been very great and would have been comparable to the difference between any of the great countries of Asia today.

I feel that we think wrongly because we are misled in our approach. Differences have crept in and been intensified by this process of industrialization and mechanization, which has promoted material well-being tremendously and which has been a blessing to humanity. At the same time, it is corroding the life of the mind and thereby encouraging a process of self-destruction. I am not, for the moment, talking or thinking about wars and the like. We have seen in history races come up and gradually fade away, in Asia, in

Europe and other places. Are we witnessing the same thing today?

It may be that this will not take effect in our life-time. In the past anyway, one great consolation was that things happened only in one particular quarter of the world. If there was a collapse in one part of the world, the other part carried on. Now, the whole world hangs together in life and death so that if this civilization fades away or collapses it will take practically the whole world down with it. No part of it will be left to survive as it could in olden times. During the so-called Dark Ages of Europe, there were bright periods in Asia, in China, in India, in the Middle East and elsewhere. In the old days, if progress was limited, disaster was also limited in extent and intensity. Today, when we have arrived at a period of great progress, we have also arrived at a period of great disaster and it is a little difficult for us to choose a middle way which would enable us to achieve a little progress and, at the same time, to limit the scope of disaster. That is the major question. A person who has to carry a burden of responsibility is greatly troubled by the practical aspects of this question. I should have liked your conference to throw light on this question. Am I right in saying that the mental life of the world is in a process of deterioration, chiefly because the environment that has been created by the industrial revolution does not give time or opportunity to individuals to think? I do not deny that today there are many great thinkers but it is quite likely that they might be submerged in the mass of unthinking humanity.

We are dealing with and talking a great deal about democracy and I have little doubt that democracy is the best of all the various methods available to us for the governance of human beings. At the same time, we are seeing today—by today I mean the last two decades or so—the emergence of democracy in a somewhat uncontrolled form. When we think of democracy, we normally think of it in the rather limited sense of the 19th century or the early 20th century use of the term. Owing to the remarkable technological growth, something has happened since then and meanwhile democracy has also spread. The result is that

we have vast masses of human beings brought up by the industrial revolution, who are not encouraged or given an opportunity to think much. They live a life which, from the point of view of physical comfort, is incomparably better than it has been in any previous generation but they seldom have a chance to think. And yet in a democratic system, it is this vast mass of human beings that will ultimately govern or elect those who govern.

Are they likely to elect more or less the sort of persons they need? That becomes a little doubtful. And I think it may be said without offence—and I certainly can say without offence, for I belong to that tribe of politicians—that the quality of men who are selected by this modern democratic method of adult suffrage gradually deteriorates. There are outstanding individuals chosen, no doubt, but their quality does deteriorate because of this lack of thinking and because of the application of modern methods of propaganda. All the noise and din and the machinery of advertisement prevent men from thinking. They react to this din and noise by producing a dictator or a dumb politician, who is insensitive, who can stand all the din and noise in the world and yet remain standing on his two feet. He gets elected while his rival collapses because he cannot stand all this din. It is an extraordinary state of affairs. It is all very well for us to praise the growth of democracy and I am all for it. The point that I wish to make is not in regard to democracy but rather in regard to the fact that modern life does not encourage the life of the mind. If the life of the mind is not encouraged, then inevitably civilization deteriorates, the race deteriorates and ultimately both collapse in some big cataclysm or just fade away and become as other races and civilizations have become.

PAST AND PRESENT

M^R CHAIRMAN, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have accepted with pleasure the task of inaugurating the National Art Treasures Fund, not because I happen to be a particularly suitable person in matters connected with art but because I greatly admire it, albeit as an inexperienced layman. I consider it very important that the artistic and aesthetic side of a nation's growth should be given prominence. Naturally, a government has to deal largely with what might be called the primary needs of the people. It can hardly think of anything else before the primary needs are satisfied. Nevertheless, no country and no people can subsist only on primary needs; they certainly cannot grow. Apart from food, one has also to provide them with other fare—clothing and other necessities of life. After all, when we talk of the growth of a people, of civilization, of cultural life, we think of all manner of things, besides these primary needs. We think of their mental, intellectual and spiritual growth and of the artistic and aesthetic needs of their lives. We, perhaps, also think of the danger that some of these primary needs of life might suffer at the hands of other tendencies which are certainly very important, provided they are kept within proper bounds and not allowed to become the masters of human destiny.

Delhi has got no proper museum. We have some small collections here that are good but they are practically nothing compared with the great museums of Europe and America. And that is unfortunate for all of us, more especially for our children who receive their ideas of beauty or lack of beauty from such institutions. If I may say so with all respect, the governmental structures of Delhi are not all very beautiful to look at, although some of them are obviously meant to impress. If you want to see architectural beauty in India, you have to go back to the buildings of another age. So, it is important to have museums, not only to keep treasures intact and make them accessible but also to enable the rising generations to look at them, so that they can have some idea

of India in regard to the finer aspects of life. Personally, I should imagine that any proper teaching of history would include the artistic and cultural development of a people as an essential element. Without that, history becomes a string of events, of battles and of kings, which can neither inspire nor do much good to anybody. It does not really matter very much whether you remember the names of kings or not but it is important that you remember the artistic achievements of a race.

I believe, we have some good museums in India, though they can hardly be compared with the great museums and galleries of the West. The type of great art we have has essentially to be seen on the site itself. It is not normally a thing that can be placed in a museum, sometimes because it is part of big structures and sometimes because it has almost grown out of the very rocks. It is part of the natural scene like some of our great sculptures, caves and frescoes. It is right that these places should become, even more so than they are now, places of artistic pilgrimage for us so that we may learn from them not only something of the past but something of the grace of life which can, perhaps, affect our present life also. We cannot transport these big architectural monuments but there are still plenty of art treasures in India which can be kept together. It is important that we should keep these things not only for ourselves but also for our friends from outside India who may come here and who may like to see them assembled in a few places rather than to have to hunt for them in odd places all over India.

I think that the step which has been proposed is an important one in this direction, because art, like some other things, should not become just a governmental affair and should not depend entirely on the encouragement of the government. Governments should, of course, encourage it but governments have a peculiar way of working and they somehow become rigid and lose touch with the popular mind. Therefore, it is right that we should bring in others into this organization; in fact, if I may say so, we should give the lead to those of our people who love art to build up these great art collections.

Here is this city of New Delhi and Old Delhi is nearby. There are many things in Old Delhi which, perhaps, many of us and many of you do not like. They are certainly capable of improvement. Nevertheless, there are many things in Old Delhi, old buildings, for instance, which stand out. But there is something more than that. There is the spirit and the genius of an ancient city, where almost every stone tells you a story, where history is embedded even in the dirty lanes—the history of events and the history of a people in their happiness and sorrow through long ages past. There is this ancient city with much that is good and much that is bad: but it has a definite and positive atmosphere which you can feel in your bones if you go there, especially if you know something about the tremendous past of Old Delhi which is supposed to be the seventh city of Delhi. New Delhi attracts large numbers of people for business or pleasure and it has some big and impressive buildings and plenty of offices. Large numbers of people, directly or indirectly concerned with the administration of India, sit in these offices and work away. But New Delhi has always seemed to me to be a place without a soul and without spirit. In spite of its large structures of stone and brick and in spite of a certain attractiveness which some of the New Delhi buildings may possess, New Delhi is not an attractive place. This is not so because of the buildings; I am talking more of the atmosphere that surrounds it. Now, you cannot develop the right atmosphere in a city too quickly. But, at any rate, you can lay the foundation for it; you can help that atmosphere to grow.

Art galleries and museums in a great city are like windows which look out on the broader, richer and deeper things of life. I feel somewhat ashamed that in this great capital of India we have nothing really worthy of being called a museum. We have plenty of good things. There is a place called "The Central Museum of Asian Antiquities." Once I went there and found that the last visitor had come three months ago. Well, that is really odd. It struck me as odd that, on an average, there should be only one visitor every three months to the Museum of Asian Antiquities. When I went there, naturally, the people in charge were somewhat

upset—they were not expecting visitors and they had to be sent for from all over the place. People were working in an office in a musty and dusty atmosphere. That is the way in which a typical governmental museum functions. It is not interested in the public seeing the exhibits; it is interested in ticketing and docketing and presenting a report at the end. Now, even that may have some value for the future. But certainly the value it has in the present is practically nil, because the museum is not a part of the life of the people but merely of the officials who sit there. The whole idea of museums somehow seems to be unconnected with the life of our people. It lives in the upper atmosphere of officials. That is not good enough and the question arises how we can make museums a vital part of our people's lives, of the lives of our school children and of college boys and girls who can come and see and learn from them and be inspired by objects of art and thus develop their own creative talents by looking at the great creations of the past. Therefore, I greatly welcome the creation of this Fund in the hope that it will lead to the creation of that atmosphere even in this official ridden city of New Delhi as also in the other great cities of India. I should like the whole country to be dotted with museums. They cannot all be very big; you cannot spread out the treasures all over the country. They have to remain more or less concentrated to be properly looked after. They can be duplicated to some extent at other places, too. What I am anxious about is this: every child of India should see something of these artistic treasures, should understand something that has gone to build up India, should assimilate, even if in a small measure, the genius of India, which, adapted to the modern conditions, should make the country grow.

THE WAY TO SPIRITUAL REVIVAL

IN THIS solemn gathering of Bhikkus and Buddhist scholars from all over the world, I see something of history. This Conference has a deep significance for us in India and must have the same significance for the whole world because the latter is at a turning point in history. The message of the Buddha may well solve the problems of our troubled and tormented world. I came to Sanchi, not to give you a message but to search for something myself. In this torn and distorted world, I am a very confused person. I see no light and often stumble. I try to search for what is lacking in me and to find out what is wanted of me by my country and my people.

History today has ceased to be the history of this country or that. It has become the history of mankind because we are all tied up together in a common fate.

In India, as in other countries, great lights have shone to show us the right way. Not only has India been the scene of these great teachings but she has also sent them abroad to light up the darkness in other countries. The message that the Buddha gave 2,500 years ago shed its light not only on India or Asia but on the whole world.

The question that inevitably suggests itself is, how far can the great message of the Buddha apply to the present-day world? Perhaps it may apply, perhaps, it may not; but I do know that if we follow the principles enunciated by the Buddha, we will ultimately win peace and tranquillity for the world. For all we know we may be sowing such seeds in this Conference as will flower for the good of humanity.

TO THE UNIVERSITIES

ENDS AND MEANS

I HAVE come to you not so much in my capacity as Prime Minister of a great country or a politician but rather as a humble seeker after truth and as one who has continuously struggled to find the way, not always with success, to fit action to the objectives and ideals that he has held. The process is always difficult but it becomes increasingly so in this world of conflict and passion. Politicians have to deal with day to day problems and they seek immediate remedies. Philosophers think of ultimate objectives and are apt to lose touch with the day to day world and its problems. Neither approach appears to be adequate by itself. Is it possible to combine those two approaches and function after the manner of Plato's philosopher-kings? You, Sir, who have had the experience of the role of a great man of action and also that of a philosopher as head of this university, should be able to help us to answer this question.

In this world of incessant and feverish activity, men have little time to think, much less to consider ideals and objectives. Yet, how are we to act, even in the present, unless we know which way we are going and what our objectives are? It is only in the peaceful atmosphere of a university that these basic problems can be adequately considered. It is only when the young men and women, who are in the university today and on whom the burden of life's problems will fall tomorrow, learn to have clear objectives and standards of values that there is hope for the next generation. The past generation produced some great men but as a generation it led the world repeatedly to disaster. Two world wars are the price that has been paid for the lack of wisdom on man's part in this generation. It is a terrible price and the tragedy of it is that, even after the price has been paid, we have

not purchased real peace or a cessation of conflict and an even deeper tragedy is that mankind does not profit by its experience and continues to go the same way that led previously to disaster.

We have had wars and we have had victory and we have celebrated that victory; yet, what is victory and how do we measure it? A war is fought presumably to gain certain objectives. The defeat of the enemy is not by itself an objective but rather the removal of an obstruction towards the attainment of the objective. If that objective is not attained, then that victory over the enemy brings only negative relief and indeed is not a real victory. We have seen, however, that the aim in wars is almost entirely to defeat the enemy and the other and real objective is often forgotten. The result has been that the victory attained by defeating the enemy has only been a very partial one and has not solved the real problem; if it has solved the immediate problem, it has, at the same time, given rise to many other and sometimes worse problems. Therefore, it becomes necessary to have the real objective clear in our minds at all times whether in war or in peace and always to aim at achieving the objective.

I think also that there is always a close and intimate relationship between the end we aim at and the means adopted to attain it. Even if the end is right but the means are wrong, it will vitiate the end or divert us in a wrong direction. Means and ends are thus intimately and inextricably connected and cannot be separated. That, indeed, has been the lesson of old taught us by many great men in the past but unfortunately it is seldom remembered.

I am venturing to place some of these ideas before you, not because they are novel but because they have impressed themselves upon me in the course of my life which has been spent in alternating periods of incessant activity and conflict and enforced leisure. The great leader of my country, Mahatma Gandhi, under whose inspiration and sheltering care I grew up, always laid stress on moral values and warned us never to subordinate means to ends. We were not worthy of him and yet, to the best of our ability, we tried to follow his teaching. Even the limited extent to which we could

follow his teaching yielded rich results. After a generation of intense struggle with a great and powerful nation, we achieved success and, perhaps, the most significant part of it, for which credit is due to both parties, was the manner of its achievement. History hardly affords a parallel to the solution of such a conflict in a peaceful way, followed by friendly and co-operative relations. It is astonishing how rapidly bitterness and ill will between the two nations have faded away, giving place to co-operation. And we in India have decided of our own free will to continue this co-operation as an independent nation.

I would not presume to offer advice to other and more experienced nations in any way. But may I suggest for your consideration that there is some lesson in India's peaceful revolution which might be applied to the larger problems before the world today? That revolution demonstrated to us that physical force need not necessarily be the arbiter of man's destiny and that the method of waging a struggle and the way of its termination are of paramount importance. Past history shows us the important part that physical force has played. But it also shows us that no such force can ultimately ignore the moral forces of the world; and if it attempts to do so, it does so at its peril. Today, this problem faces us in all its intensity, because the weapons that physical force has at its disposal are terrible to contemplate. Must the twentieth century differ from primitive barbarism only in the destructive efficacy of the weapons that man's ingenuity has invented for man's destruction? I do believe, in accordance with my master's teaching, that there is another way to meet this situation and solve the problem that faces us.

I realize that a statesman or a man who has to deal with public affairs cannot ignore realities and cannot act in terms of abstract truth. His activity is always limited by the degree of receptivity of the truth by his fellow-men. Nevertheless, the basic truth remains truth and is always to be kept in view and, as far as possible, it should guide our actions. Otherwise we get caught up in a vicious circle of evil when one evil action leads to another.

India is a very old country with a great past. But she is a new country also with new urges and desires. Since August

1947, she has been in a position to pursue a foreign policy of her own. She was limited by the realities of the situation which we could not ignore or overcome. But even so, she could not forget the lesson of her great leader. She has tried to adapt, however imperfectly, theory to reality in so far as she could. In the family of nations she was a newcomer and could not influence them greatly to begin with. But she had a certain advantage. She had great potential resources that could, no doubt, increase her power and influence. A greater advantage lay in the fact that she was not fettered by the past, by old enmities or old ties, by historic claims or traditional rivalries. Even against her former rulers there was no bitterness left. Thus, India came into the family of nations with no prejudices or enmities, ready to welcome and be welcomed. Inevitably, she had to consider her foreign policy in terms of enlightened self-interest but at the same time she brought to it a touch of her idealism. Thus, she has tried to combine idealism with national interest. The main objectives of that policy are: the pursuit of peace, not through alignment with any major power or group of powers but through an independent approach to each controversial or disputed issues, the liberation of subject peoples, the maintenance of freedom, both national and individual, the elimination of racial discrimination and the elimination of want, disease and ignorance which afflict the greater part of the world's population. I am asked frequently why India does not align herself with a particular nation or a group of nations and told that because we have refrained from doing so we are sitting on the fence. The question and the comment are easily understood, because in times of crisis it is not unnatural for those who are involved in it deeply to regard calm objectivity in others as irrational, short-sighted, negative, unreal or even unmanly. But I should like to make it clear that the policy India has sought to pursue is not a negative and neutral policy. It is a positive and a vital policy that flows from our struggle for freedom and from the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi. Peace is not only an absolute necessity for us in India in order to progress and develop but is also of paramount importance to the world. How can that peace

be preserved? Not by surrendering to aggression, not by compromising with evil or injustice but also not by talking and preparing for war! Aggression has to be met, for it endangers peace. At the same time, the lesson of the last two wars has to be remembered and it seems to me astonishing that, in spite of that lesson, we go the same way. The very process of marshalling the world into two hostile camps precipitates the conflict which it has sought to avoid. It produces a sense of terrible fear, and that fear darkens men's minds and leads them into wrong courses. There is perhaps nothing so bad and so dangerous in life as fear. As a great President of the United States said, there is nothing really to fear except fear itself.

Our problem, therefore, becomes one of lessening and ultimately putting an end to this fear. That will not happen if all the world takes sides and talks of war. War becomes almost certain then.

We are a member of the family of nations and we have no wish to shirk any of the obligations and burdens of that membership. We have accepted fully the obligations of membership in the United Nations and intend to abide by them. We wish to make our full contribution to the common store and to render our full measure of service. But that can only be done effectively in our own way and of our own choice. We believe passionately in the democratic method and we seek to enlarge the bounds of democracy both on the political and the economic plane, for no democracy can exist for long in the midst of want and poverty and inequality. Our immediate needs are economic betterment and raising the standards of our people. The more we succeed in this, the more we can serve the cause of peace in the world. We are fully aware of our weaknesses and failings and claim no superior virtue; but we do not wish to forfeit the advantage that our present detachment gives us. We believe that the maintenance of that detachment is not only in our interest but also in the interest of world peace and freedom. That detachment is neither isolationism nor indifference nor neutrality when peace or freedom is threatened. When man's liberty or peace is in danger we cannot and shall not be

neutral; neutrality then would be a betrayal of what we have fought for and stand for.

If we seek to ensure peace we must attack the root causes of war and not merely the symptoms. What are the underlying causes of war in the modern world?

One of the basic causes is the domination of one country by another or an attempt to dominate. Large parts of Asia were ruled till recently by foreign and chiefly European Powers. We ourselves were part of the British Empire, as were also Pakistan, Ceylon and Burma. France, Holland and Portugal still have territories over which they rule. But the rising tide of nationalism and the love of independence have submerged most of the Western Empires in Asia. In Indonesia, I hope that there will soon be an independent Sovereign State. We hope also that French Indo-China will achieve freedom and peace before long under a government of its own choice. Much of Africa, however, is subject to foreign Powers, some of whom still attempt to enlarge their dominions. It is clear that all remaining vestiges of imperialism and colonialism will have to disappear.

Secondly, there is the problem of racial relations. The progress of some races in knowledge or in invention, their success in war and conquest, has tempted them to believe that they are racially superior and has led them to treat other nations with contempt. A recent example of this was the horrible attempt, so largely successful, to exterminate the Jews. In Asia and Africa, racial superiority has been most widely and most insolently exhibited. It is forgotten that nearly all the great religions of mankind arose in the East and that wonderful civilizations grew up there when Europe and America were still unknown to history. The West has too often despised the Asian and the African and still, in many places, denies them not only equality of rights but even common humanity and kindness. This is one of the great danger points of our modern world; and now that Asia and Africa are shaking off their torpor and arousing themselves, out of this evil may come a conflagration of which no man can see the range of consequences. One of your greatest men said that this country cannot exist half slave

and half free. The world cannot long maintain peace if half of it is enslaved and despised. The problem is not always simple nor can it be solved by a resolution or a decree. Unless there is a firm and sincere determination to solve it, there will be no peace.

The third reason for war and revolution is the misery and want of millions of people in many countries and, in particular, in Asia and Africa. In the West, though the war has brought much misery and many difficulties, the common man generally lives in some measure of comfort—he has food, clothing and shelter to some extent. The basic problem of the East, therefore, is to obtain these necessities of life. If they are lacking, then there is the apathy of despair or the destructive rage of the revolutionary. Political subjection, racial inequality, economic inequality and misery—these are the evils that we have to remove if we would ensure peace. If we can offer no remedy, then other cries and slogans will make an appeal to the minds of the people.

Many of the countries of Asia have entered the family of nations; others we hope will soon find a place in this circle. We have the same hopes for the countries of Africa. This process should proceed rapidly and America and Europe should use their great influence and power to facilitate it. We see before us vast changes taking place, not only in the political and economic spheres but even more so in the minds of men. Asia is becoming dynamic again and is passionately eager to progress and raise the economic standards of her vast masses. This awakening of a giant continent is of the greatest importance to the future of mankind and requires imaginative statesmanship of a high order. The problems of this awakening will not be solved by looking at it with fear or in a spirit of isolationism by any of us. It requires a friendly and understanding approach, clear objectives and a common effort to realize them. The colossal expenditure of energy and resources on armaments is an outstanding feature of many national budgets today but that does not solve the problem of world peace. Perhaps, even a fraction of that outlay, utilized in other ways and for other purposes, will provide a more enduring basis for peace and happiness.

That is India's view, offered in all friendliness to all thinking men and women, to all persons of goodwill in the name of our common humanity. That view is not based on wishful thinking but on a deep consideration of the problems that afflict us all, and on its merits I venture to place it before you.

I should like to add a few words, Sir. I have been deeply moved by what you have said, by what was said about me in the previous citation and I have felt very humble as I listened to these remarks.

The scene that I see here under your distinguished presidency will long remain in my mind. Indeed, I do not think that I shall ever forget it. I shall remember the scene and above all I shall remember the great courtesy, kindness and generosity with which you have received me here and made me one of yourselves.

I shall prize the honour of being a fellow member with you of this great University, above the other honours that have come my way. I shall prize it, not only in my individual capacity as I believe that this honour was, perhaps, meant for more than an individual and that, for the moment, you have treated me not as an individual but also as a symbol for and representative of India. And here, Sir, forgetting myself for a moment, I thank you on behalf of my country and my people.

THE GANDHIAN TECHNIQUE

YOU KNOW that during the last thirty years or so, we carried on rather intensively our campaign for India's freedom. We did not begin it; it was there. It had been continued for generations before us but it came more to the world's notice then, because a world figure stepped into the arena of Indian politics—that is, Mahatma Gandhi. And he produced a very remarkable change in India.

Whoever it was, they were treated badly. They never had any relief from the tremendous burden they endured.

Well, Gandhi came and he told them that there was a way out—a way of achieving freedom. 'First of all,' he said, 'shed your fear. Do not be afraid, and then act in a united way but always peacefully. Do not bear any ill will in your hearts against your opponent. You are fighting a system, not an individual, not a race, not the people of another country. You are fighting the imperialist system or the colonial system.' Now, it was not very easy for us to understand all this; and much more difficult it must have been for others, our peasantry, for instance. But the fact remains that there was some power in his voice, something in him which seemed to infuse other people with courage and make them feel that this man was not an empty talker, that he meant what he said and that he would be able to 'deliver the goods', if I may put it so.

Almost magically, his influence spread. He was well known before also but not in this particular way. And within a few months we saw a change come over our countryside. The peasantry began to behave differently. It straightened its back. It could look you in the face. It had self-confidence and self-reliance. Now, this did not happen automatically, of course, for Gandhi's message was carried to these peasants in the countryside by tens of thousands of young men and young women. First of all they went to the people who became enthusiastic about it and accepted it. Within a few months, the whole aspect of India changed.

Now, it is simple enough to say, 'Do not be afraid.' There is nothing magical about that. Of what were we afraid? What is a person normally afraid of? Many things. We were afraid of being put in prison. We were afraid of our property being confiscated for sedition. We were afraid, if you like, of being shot at and killed as rebels. Well, Gandhi argued with us, 'After all, if you are so frantically keen on freedom, what does it matter if you go to prison, if your property is confiscated or even if you are killed? It does not matter much, because you will get something infinitely more. Apart from serving for a great cause and apart from possibly


Whoever it was, they were treated badly. They never had any relief from the tremendous burden they endured.

Well, Gandhi came and he told them that there was a way out—a way of achieving freedom. 'First of all,' he said, 'shed your fear. Do not be afraid, and then act in a united way but always peacefully. Do not bear any ill will in your hearts against your opponent. You are fighting a system, not an individual, not a race, not the people of another country. You are fighting the imperialist system or the colonial system.'

Now, it was not very easy for us to understand all this; and much more difficult it must have been for others, our peasantry, for instance. But the fact remains that there was some power in his voice, something in him which seemed to infuse other people with courage and make them feel that this man was not an empty talker, that he meant what he said and that he would be able to 'deliver the goods', if I may put it so.

Almost magically, his influence spread. He was well known before also but not in this particular way. And within a few months we saw a change come over our countryside. The peasantry began to behave differently. It straightened its back. It could look you in the face. It had self-confidence and self-reliance. Now, this did not happen automatically, of course, for Gandhi's message was carried to these peasants in the countryside by tens of thousands of young men and young women. First of all they went to the people who became enthusiastic about it and accepted it. Within a few months, the whole aspect of India changed.

Now, it is simple enough to say, 'Do not be afraid.' There is nothing magical about that. Of what were we afraid? What is a person normally afraid of? Many things. We were afraid of being put in prison. We were afraid of our property being confiscated for sedition. We were afraid, if you like, of being shot at and killed as rebels. Well, Gandhi argued with us, 'After all, if you are so frightfully keen on freedom, what does it matter if you go to prison, if your property is confiscated or even if you are killed? It does not matter much, because you will get something infinitely more. Apart from serving for a great cause and apart from possibly



*At the opening of the new
Vihara at Sanchi, November 1952*




Addressing the first meeting of the National Development Council, November 1952



*In a field headquarters during
military exercises, April 1953*

*With Sri Mahavir Tyagi, addressing officers of the
Indian Army proceeding to Korea, August 1953*



achieving results, the mere act of doing this will fill you with a certain satisfaction and joy.'

Somehow or other that voice seemed to convince masses of people; and there came about a tremendous change.

Thus started in India what might be called the 'Gandhi era' in our politics, which lasted until his death and which, in some form or other, will always continue. I mention this so that you may have some kind of a picture of how we behaved. Large numbers of us gave up our normal professions and avocations and went to the villages preaching this gospel. We also preached other things which our political organization demanded and we forgot almost everything else that we used to do. Our lives changed, not very deliberately—they simply changed, automatically and completely, so much so that it was a little difficult for us even to interest ourselves in those activities with which we had been previously associated. We were absorbed in the new activity of the moment—and not just for a moment but for years.

Obviously, we could not have done so if we did not find a great deal of satisfaction in it. We did find satisfaction; and when people imagine that I have gone through a great deal of pain and suffering because I went to prison for a number of years, they are perhaps partly right. They are, however, fundamentally wrong in another sense, because most of us who endured privations felt that period to be the most significant in our lives. It was not a period which might be measured in terms of normal happiness but it was something deeper than that—a period in which we felt a certain satisfaction. Why? Because, for the moment, our ideals were in conformity with our actions or, to put it in the other way, we acted in accordance with our ideals. And there can be no greater satisfaction to an individual than when there is such a synthesis of thought and action in him. Then he becomes, for the moment, an integrated individual and he functions with power and strength and without doubt. The real difficulties seldom come from an external source. Real difficulties are those which arise in our own minds when we are in doubt; they can also arise when we are not able to act in

accordance with our conviction for some reason. Then there is difficulty and obstruction within ourselves and complexes arise. We had the feeling of tremendous satisfaction in what we were doing, because during that period we became integrated human beings in whom thought and action more or less went together.

We wanted results, of course. We were working for results but for the moment we were satisfied with the act of doing, results apart. We had ups and downs, apparent failures for the moment. But such was the nature of the technique of action which Gandhi had taught us that even in a moment of apparent failure there really was no going back.

You may have heard that a large number of us, a hundred thousand of us, were in prison and apparently nothing was happening in India. The movement for freedom was suppressed. It was so, in a superficial sense. Six months later or a year later, suddenly one would find that the movement was very alive. Repeatedly, the British Government was amazed. It would think that it had put an end to this business; and then it would find that it had started off at a higher pitch than ever. A movement, which was a peculiar mixture of mass activity and individual action (that is, each individual doing something regardless of whether others did it or not), is a type very difficult to crush. It may be suppressed for a while; but because there is the individual incentive and because the individual wants to act regardless of whether others act or not, and when thousands and tens of thousands of individuals feel that way, it is very difficult to suppress them.

How do governments function? A democratic government in the ultimate analysis functions largely with the goodwill of the people and with their co-operation. It cannot go very much against them. Even an autocratic government has to have a measure of goodwill. It cannot function without it. In the ultimate analysis, a government functions because of certain sanctions which it has and which are represented by its army or police force. If the government is in line with the thought of a majority of the people, it is a democratic government and only a very small minority of the people will feel its pressure. Now, if an individual refuses to be afraid

of these sanctions, what is the government to do about it? It may put him in prison. He is not afraid; he welcomes it. He may be, if you like, shot down. He is not afraid of facing death. Well, then a government has to face a crisis; that is, a government, in spite of its great power, cannot really conquer an individual. It may kill him but it does not overcome him. That is failure on the part of the government. A government, which is essentially based—apart from the other factors which I have mentioned—upon the sanctions it has, comes up against something—the spirit of man which refuses to be afraid of those sanctions.

Now, that is a thing which normal governments do not understand. They are upset by it. They do not know how to deal with it. They can, of course, deal with the individual in the normal way by treating him as a criminal. But that, too, does not work, because that man does not feel like a criminal; nor do others regard him as a criminal. So, it does not work.

So that, this process, this technique of action, was not one of overwhelming a government so much by mass action—although there was that phase of it—but rather one of undermining the prestige of a government before which an individual would not bow. Many of you, no doubt, have read something very like it in Thoreau's writings. This was developed on a mass scale by Gandhi. Naturally, the people of India were not very well trained; nor did they understand too well the philosophy of this technique of action. They were weak and frail human beings. They slipped and made mistakes and all that. Nevertheless, on the whole, they did function according to that technique; and ultimately they triumphed. That is one thing I should like you to bear in mind.

The second thing is quite different. We were fighting for political freedom. That was the primary urge—the nationalist urge for political freedom. But always, right from the beginning, this political freedom was associated in our minds with economic and social progress and freedom. The more we went—and we went all the time—to the masses of the Indian people—the peasantry, the workers, the petty shopkeepers, especially in the rural areas—and the more we

saw of the poverty of India, the more we were impressed by it. We could not conceive of any freedom which would be only political freedom and which did not bring relief to these people.

The first problem we took up, inevitably, was the land problem, because most of the peasantry were oppressed by the land tenure system in India. It was a varied system—sometimes completely feudal, sometimes something less than feudal but, nevertheless, bearing down heavily upon the tenant. So, right from the beginning in our programme, the reform of the land tenure system occupied a very prominent place.

We explored other fields, too, and drew up various economic programmes for the betterment of the people, because we looked upon political freedom not as a final goal but rather as a gateway and an opportunity for the nation to progress, as the removal of an obstruction which came in the way of our functioning as we wanted to function. The real functioning and the real progress were to come afterwards.

We made many plans and when, two and a quarter years ago, this freedom for which we had laboured came, we had a large number of plans ready for advance along all kinds of fronts—economic, educational, health, labour. But although the dream which we had dreamed for a long time was coming true—and it was exciting to see a dream come true—it did not come true quite as we had wanted it to. In the process of its coming, the country was partitioned, although with our consent, under the stress of circumstances. Wanting peace and wanting freedom and not wanting anything to delay it, we agreed to that partition, although we disliked it intensely and we rather feared the consequences. Still we thought, on balance, that a partition of the country would be the most peaceful way of achieving our ends.

As a matter of fact, peace did not follow that partition and upheavals took place. Terrible things happened—killings, massacres of large numbers of people and vast migrations from one part of the country to another. We had six million refugees or displaced persons—call them what you will—come to India, uprooted from Pakistan. And about a like number

went from India to Pakistan. Men of all types, men and women of all classes, all grades in life—rich people, poor people, middling people, peasants, workers, merchants, industrialists, financiers, educationists, professors, lawyers, doctors—leaving all their property just hurried across to save themselves. Six millions of them—just think of the number we have had to look after!

This was a terrific problem; and it is a terrific problem looking after six million refugees of all types. To remove them was difficult enough. The second thing, just to feed them and to give them shelter, was another very big task but the final and the biggest task was to rehabilitate them. We have been engaged in that for these last two years. We have rehabilitated a fairly large number but a considerable number still remains; and I am afraid that this problem is going to be with us for many years.

Look at the picture of India about the time independence came to us and just after. The coming of independence was, as you know, peaceful in the sense that there was peace between India and the United Kingdom. It was done by agreement; and the whole process was completed in an admirably peaceful way, which does great credit both to India and England.

There is one factor I should like you to remember in this particular connection. Gandhi's technique of action was not only peaceful but also effective. It showed results. It showed its effectiveness most in the way it brought about freedom and the fact that it led to no ill will between the two countries. And after achieving that freedom, though we were not completely devoid of ill feeling—I cannot say that—yet it was extraordinary how suspicion, ill will and bitterness against England faded away from our country. And, as you know, we decided of our own free will to co-operate with her in many things and we have continued to co-operate with her.

If you have to solve a problem, it is not much good solving it in such a way as to create two or three more difficult problems. That is what normally happens. Gandhi's way was not only to solve the problem but to solve it in such a

way that it was a final or relatively final solution that did not create other problems.

The problem of freedom was satisfactorily solved. Nevertheless, the ending of British rule after a hundred and fifty years, naturally, brought many problems in its trail. All kinds of new forces were released. All kinds of problems which had been arrested or hidden away came up before us. There were the Indian princes, six hundred of them, big and small. That was a difficult matter. We could not possibly have six hundred islands of independent or semi-independent territory all over India. No country could exist like that. Then, there were many reactionary elements in India which thought that when the British left there would be a period of disorder that they might take advantage of. There were feudal elements, narrow nationalistic elements, communal elements and the like. And then, on top of this came the post-partition upheaval in northern India. Naturally, it helped all these reactionary elements and they wanted to profit by it.

This was the situation we had to face. Well, we faced it and gradually overcame it. We survived and we began solving many of the big problems that had arisen. Take the Indian States problem. We have practically solved it and with remarkable speed, considering the complexity of it. Five or six hundred States have been disposed of peacefully and with the co-operation and consent of the rulers of these States. Why? Because the whole Indian State system of these maharajas and rajas and nabobs was completely artificial and was kept up by the British power. Maybe a hundred and fifty years ago it was not so artificial but much had happened since then; and I have no doubt that if the British had not been in India, these rulers either would have been removed or would have changed their character or would have been fitted into a new kind of political structure, just as in the last hundred and fifty years you have seen all kinds of principalities gradually disappearing in Europe. That would have happened in India, too.

But it could not happen because the British, an external authority, protected these people. They were completely

without strength, either in their own people or in any other way. And so, the moment the British Power was removed, the Indian princes, practically speaking, collapsed like a house of cards; and they came to terms with us. And we gave them generous terms—generous in the sense that we gave them generous pensions—but otherwise they ceased to be rulers as they had been. In some places, in two or three cases, they continue for the moment as constitutional rulers with Ministers and the other paraphernalia of democratic government. In other places they are just ex-rulers pensioned off. This major problem was solved with remarkable speed.

The land problem which we had taken up long ago, we wanted to solve with all speed, too. That is a much more difficult problem but in a great part of India—in three of our biggest provinces—it is practically solved or in the process of being solved. It meant acquiring the land from big landlords on payment of compensation. That meant rather big sums by way of compensation. Therefore, it was complicated; otherwise there was no difficulty. The actual cultivators will keep their land and the absentee owners will be paid compensation for giving up such rights as they might have had. We are proceeding with that. This is important because the biggest problem of Asia—taken as a whole—is the land or the agrarian problem. There are many other problems in Asia but the basic problem, before you can make progress in an agricultural country, is obviously the agrarian problem. I think that many of the troubles of Asia can be understood only if you keep in mind this fact; the agrarian problem is the most important.

We tackled the agrarian problem in India and, if I may say so, the basic stability of the Indian Government is due to the fact that we have dealt with the agrarian problem in a way satisfactory to the peasant in India. I might also mention in this connection that the peasantry suffered tremendously in the past with everybody sitting on their backs. Our cities grew at the expense of our peasantry. For the first time in their lives, the peasantry had a tolerably fair deal during the last war. That is, the high prices of agricultural produce brought them much more money than they had ever seen.

This resulted in their paying off the very heavy agricultural debt which was bearing down upon them. And again, for the first time also, they began to eat a little more because they got a good price. They were not forced to sell every bit of grain or other produce, as they were previously, to pay their rent. Previously, they had to sell almost everything just to hang on to their land. Because they got much higher prices for their produce, they could pay their rent easily and have something left over. So they began to eat more.

That, of course, is a very good thing—their paying off their debt and the peasantry's eating a little more wheat or rice—but this had a result that was slightly upsetting in another field. When a hundred million people begin to eat a little more, it makes a vast difference to the total food stocks of the country. And we began to suffer from food deficits. These food deficits were partly caused by the partition because some of our best wheat-growing areas went to Pakistan. There were other causes, too; but one of these causes was the fact that people were actually eating more. We wanted them to eat more but for the moment we did not have more for them to eat or rather, if they ate more, the others had less to eat and that created a problem. We could not afford, as an autocratic government might, to see people starving and dying of famine.

May I remind you that not so long ago, in 1943, six years ago, while the war was going on, there was a terrible famine in Bengal? You may remember that three million people died in the province of Bengal through sheer starvation. That famine took place for many reasons but it was directly related to the war in the sense that India's resources were thrown into the war without a thought of how that would affect the masses generally. They were deprived of even the bare necessities and, suddenly, had nothing. There was a bad harvest, there were no resources left and they died like flies. A democratic government could not face a situation like that even if it wanted to. The government would have to go and some other government would come in. So then, this food deficit took place, among other reasons, because people were eating a little more. The peasantry

would not bring to the market all they had previously brought to the market. The cities began to suffer. We had to import food—large quantities of it—which, again, became a terrible burden on us.

This was apart from the normal difficulties created by the partition. The difficulties were very great, because the partition of India meant suddenly cutting a living body into two. Everything was partitioned overnight, our communication system, telephones, telegraphs, our postal system, our irrigation system, our transport system, our railways, our army, our civil services. Everything was divided up; and in spite of the fact that it was done peacefully, it produced a certain amount of confusion. Just at this time came the upheaval and with it the vast numbers of refugees—millions of them. Then, we had also to face this food deficit and had to pay large sums of money to import food from abroad.

It was not a very easy situation for any government to face, especially a new government, after its own country had been partitioned and all its services and everything had been upset. However, we have gone through this period and on the whole have made good. And may I say that because we have gone through this period and faced all these dangers and difficulties, as well as the previous hardships during our struggle for freedom, we have gained a sense of self-confidence? And we feel that we know very well that we have more difficult problems to face than we have already faced and overcome. And so, there is a general feeling of confidence in the country in regard to the economic or other problems which we may have. We shall get over them. It will mean hard work. But we are perfectly prepared for hard work. We do not try to delude our people into thinking that they are going to have a soft time. But what they want is not a soft time but a picture of the future for which they should work—a picture in which they can see, first of all, a progressive improvement of their lot and present burdens being more or less fairly shared by all groups instead of being borne by some groups and not by others. The latter, as you can well appreciate, can be a very irritating thing.

That is the position of India. That being so, our primary

concern in India today is to build this new India, to make it prosperous, to do everything which would enable the economy to improve, create more wealth and increase production. In doing that, we feel that we should pay much more attention to what might be called the basic industries or certain basic things than to other rather superficial industries.

Our first attention is paid, therefore, to certain river valley schemes. Some of them are very big schemes—bigger than the Tennessee Valley Authority; many of them are smaller. These river valley schemes are multipurpose schemes—first of all, to avoid floods; secondly, to irrigate large areas of land for the production of food; thirdly, for hydro-electric power; then, also, to prevent soil erosion and malaria; and, ultimately, to help the growth of industry.

These are very ambitious schemes and rather costly. In our enthusiasm we wanted to go ahead with dozens and dozens of these schemes. We had to slow down a little when we found that we did not have the technical personnel or the financial capacity to go ahead with all of them. Nevertheless, we are going ahead with some of the big ones and many of the small ones; and we hope to go ahead with the others soon enough.

Then we want to develop certain other basic industries—steel, for example. We have a very big steel plant. It is not enough. We want to have more steel plants and machine tool industries. Unless one has these basic things, one cannot industrialize a country. We want to industrialize India. We will not, of course, change her fundamentally agricultural character thereby, because, however much we may industrialize her, India will still remain basically an agricultural country whether India wants to or not.

India suddenly has to face new contacts with Asian countries and new responsibilities. Of course, whether you think in terms of trade or commerce or defence, India comes into the picture—whether it is Western Asia or South-East Asia or the Far East. You may consider South-East Asian problems apart from Western Asian problems but in both these India comes in. So, India cannot be isolated. In the world today, no country—big or small—can just isolate

itself. We have to face very difficult problems and those people who are in positions of responsibility have really a terrific burden to carry. The burden would, anyhow, be very difficult and great but the real difficulty, a moral difficulty, if I may say so, is this: you may, perhaps, be convinced in your mind of a certain course of action which is right or, if I may put it another way, you may be convinced of what is truth in a certain context. If you are convinced as an individual, it is your duty to follow that line regardless of consequences. As a political leader, you do not function as an individual; you function through other individuals whom you lead. You have to make those other individuals also understand the truth as you perceive it. It is not enough for you to perceive it. They are the material through which you act and, therefore, the measure of their activity is governed not by your understanding but by their own understanding of what you say.

Difficult problems, political or moral, thus arise. That you have to function through a medium is a limiting factor. You have to function through masses of men or governments or groups, not as an individual. You may be a very great leader—a prophet if you like—but you are functioning as an individual, no doubt influencing others, no doubt influencing succeeding generations tremendously but, nevertheless, functioning as an individual. First of all, political leaders are not prophets; nor are they, normally, great seekers after truth. Even if they choose to follow what they consider the right path, they are limited by the fact that they have to make others move and not themselves. And so, they inevitably have to compromise. In the context of things, they have to compromise, because there are so many forces at play which they cannot control. Either they retire from the scene or they compromise. Now, once you start compromising, you are on a slippery slope and it may land you anywhere. So, what is one to do? On the one hand, there is this danger of your losing all touch with reality or truth, if you like; on the other hand, unless you compromise, you do not acknowledge reality, you are cut off from it and function merely as an individual and not as a leader.

This is a difficult problem which each one of us in his own small or big way has to face. I know no answer to it, because there can be no general answer; and each case has to be measured and considered separately. But I would say this: even when one compromises, one should never compromise in regard to the basic truth. One may limit the application of it, remembering always the basic way, the basic objective and where the aim lies. If we always remember the basic objective and always aim that way, it may be permissible, as a next step, to say something much less than that which people understand. But if we forget the basic objective, then the small step may lead us astray.

In the present-day world, people talk of the atom bomb and are afraid of all the possible consequences which even the present generation might have to face. It is a very extraordinary situation, because one may say that science and the application of science have developed so much that it should be easily possible for the whole world to satisfy not only the primary needs of humanity but other needs also and to have full opportunities of individual or group development without the necessity of any conflict. I think that it can be mathematically shown that it is possible for the whole world to prosper if the resources of the world were turned in the direction of the betterment of humanity instead of so much of them being used for and wasted for purposes of war and the preparation for war. For the first time in history, mankind has the key to its happiness in its own hands. If this problem had arisen two or three hundred years ago, it would, perhaps, have been difficult to solve, because all mankind could not prosper together at that time.

And yet, just when we can solve a problem which has afflicted the world through ages past, we, so to speak, with our own goodwill or ill will, raise this new problem which may be exemplified today by the atom bomb. Of course, the atom bomb is only a symbol of other things. It is an extraordinary thing that we live in fear of it all the time, not knowing when sudden disaster may descend upon us. I am not terribly afraid of it because I do not think that there is much likelihood of that disaster descending upon us in the

near future or for some years to come. I hope that if these years are properly utilized, it will never come, provided we work to that end consciously, provided we are not terribly afraid. The real danger of the situation is that of fear and that *wrong steps* might be taken because of fear.

We have got into a vicious circle. I am quite certain that in the world today there are very few persons who can conceivably think of war and that in every country a vast number of people, almost everyone, desires peace. And yet, in spite of that, there must be something wrong with our thinking or with our actions. Why should we be caught in this web? We may say, of course, that it is not our fault, that it is other people's fault. And it is, doubtless, true. Nevertheless, there is something wrong about our getting caught in that dilemma. Gandhi always told us, 'You have no business to blame the British for the failures in your national movement, the failures in what you are trying to do. Of course, the British Government would try to check you; that is their function. So long as they do not agree and so long as the whole matter is not settled, they will check you. So, what is the good of blaming them, because they check you and defeat you? It shows your failure. It is always your failure if you do not succeed, not the Britisher's failure. So, it is not much good our blaming them for it.'

It is not much good our blaming others. Others, no doubt, are to blame. That is not the point. But we should find a way out and not depend upon the goodwill or the ill will of others, for then we become dependent on what others do in regard to war and peace.

I have obviously no magical formula to offer anybody in regard to this dilemma, which is a very difficult one for a politician, for any person with responsibility cannot afford to take a risk about his country. He has to prepare for every eventuality. He has to prepare against any possible aggression. He cannot, humanity being what it is, just take up the line of complete passive resistance and say, 'We shall do nothing and hope that nobody else will do anything.' He cannot take any risk and he has to be ready for every possible contingency.

On the other hand, the very act of that preparation sometimes goes so far as to bring a possible conflict nearer; and it is obvious that a conflict, if it comes on a world-scale, is likely to be a disaster of unparalleled magnitude. Nobody knows exactly what will happen but one thing is dead certain: the modern world, as it functions today and modern civilization as it is, will hardly survive.

If that is so—and we must realize that that is likely to happen—then it is not merely a question of victory and defeat. Of course, victory is always desirable so that we may do what we want to do. But the question is a much deeper one—that of achieving certain objectives at which you aim. When you fight a war, you fight it to attain certain objectives. Victory is not the objective but a step, the removal of an obstruction, so that you may attain the objective. If you forget that objective, then the victory you gain becomes a hollow victory. It is some relief, no doubt, but you have not gained the objective. Hence, the last two wars, which have been tremendous victories in the military sense, have somehow not relieved the tensions of the world.

Perhaps, in this context, it is worth while thinking how far the Gandhian technique is applicable. I do not know how far it is applicable practically, because there are innumerable difficulties but I do think that whether or not it is practically applicable, in our mental and psychological life it may help us a great deal.

THE AGE OF CRISIS

FOR NEARLY three weeks I have been a wanderer in this vast country and have visited many great cities and famous universities. Wherever I have gone, I have received a whole-hearted welcome and generous hospitality. I have met many of the leaders of this country; men and women who wield

authority and shoulder responsibility in various phases of a great nation's activities. I have also had glimpses of many others who work in field or factory and are the backbone of the nation. I wish I could have more opportunities of meeting ordinary people and seeing them at work and at play. But my time was limited and so, regretfully, I had to deprive myself of this opportunity.

The President of the United States described my visit to this country in vivid language as a voyage of discovery. That description was true enough, as I had to learn and find out many things; and yet, how can any one discover this great country in three or four weeks? All my life I have been engaged in a quest—the discovery of my own country—India. During this life's journey of discovery, I have found much in my country that inspired me, much that interested me and much that made me understand a little of what India was and is today. And yet India, with the weight of ages behind her and with her urges and desires in the present, has only been partially discovered by me and I am continually finding out new facets of her many-sided personality that continually surprise me.

How then can I presume to discover this great country during a brief visit? And yet, even a brief visit may give some insight into the ideals and objectives and the springs of action of a nation. So, I made myself receptive in order to understand somewhat the spirit of America and the sources of the inner strength that have made her great. All the world sees, sometimes, perhaps, with a little envy, her great prosperity and the tremendous advance she has made in the application of science for human betterment. From that, all of us have much to learn; and yet, it was obvious to me that no great material advance could take place or could last long unless there were deeper foundations underlying it. The picture of the average American presented to the outside world is of a hard-headed, efficient and practical businessman, intent on making money and using that money to add to his power and influence. That picture, no doubt, has some truth in it. And yet there is another picture and, I think, a much more enduring one, of a warmhearted and

very generous people, full of goodwill for others and with a firm belief in the basic principles on which this great Republic was founded—the principles of freedom, equality and democracy. It has been my good fortune to see this latter picture wherever I have gone and this has made me realize wherein lies the real strength of America. Everywhere I have found a love of freedom and a desire for peace and co-operation and, among the people, a frankness and human approach which make friendly understanding easy. Because of this approach I have also ventured to speak frankly what I had in my mind.

After spending some days on the east coast of this continental country, paying brief visits to the middle west and having a glimpse of the south, I have now come to the western coast of America and to the famous and cosmopolitan city of San Francisco. I could not have gone back to India without visiting the west coast about which I had heard so much.

During these wanderings of mine, I have noticed the great variety of American life and at the same time the fundamental unity of it. I have been reminded again and again of my own country with its vast extent and its diversity and unity. The United States, astride between two great oceans, looks out to the east towards Asia. So also India has had many windows looking out at various parts of the great Asian continent. India has had close contacts with Western Asia, Central Asia, South-East Asia and the Far East. Geography has played a dominant part in the history and development of both the United States and India and will no doubt continue to influence considerably the course of events in the future. That influence is not so great today as it used to be, because of the tremendous developments of transport and communications which make every country almost a neighbour of another. The United States, by virtue of her origin and history, naturally looked towards Europe and only gradually spread towards the west because, for a long period, Europe was the principal centre of the world's activities.

A change of supreme importance has now come over the world scene and that is the renaissance of Asia. Perhaps, when

the history of our times comes to be written, the re-entry of this old continent of Asia—which has seen so many ups and downs—into world politics will be the most outstanding fact of this and the next generation. All the world is concerned with this but more particularly the United States, because of her geographical and pivotal position, apart from the great power that she wields in world affairs today.

The world is full of unsolved problems today; perhaps, all of them can be considered as parts of one single problem. This problem cannot be solved unless the full implication of the renascence of Asia is kept in mind, for Asia will inevitably play an ever growing part in world affairs. Asia, arrested in her growth, faces this world problem in two of its major aspects—political and economic. The political problem, that is, the achievement of political freedom, has a certain priority because without it no effective progress is possible. But owing to the delay in the achievement of political freedom, the economic problem has become equally important and urgent. National freedom is thus the first essential in Asia and, although most of the countries of Asia have achieved this, some still remain under colonial domination. These relics of foreign rule will have to go, giving place to national freedom, thus satisfying nationalism, which is the predominant urge of Asian peoples. The economic betterment of the vast masses of Asia is equally essential, both from their point of view and from the point of view of world peace and stability. This will involve a progressive industrialization of these countries and in this the United States can play a vital role.

There is another danger point that is always to be borne in mind and that is racial discrimination and inequality. This is also a relic from the past, which has no place today and is naturally resented by those who suffer from it.

India is an ancient country with millennia of history behind her but she faces the world today as a young and dynamic nation. For thirty years she concentrated on her struggle for national freedom. And that struggle, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, was an unusual one. That great man, whom we call the Father of our Nation, gave some impress of his mighty personality to India and more

especially to our generation. And so, today, as we look out upon the world and fashion our foreign policy, we are governed by something of that idealism as well as the realistic approach that Gandhi gave to our struggle. If India is to play any effective part in world affairs or even in her own development, she has to function in conformity with the ideals that she has held for these many years. Those ideals are essentially of peace and co-operation, of national freedom, of a growing internationalism leading to a world order, of equality among nations and people and of the eradication of want and misery from the millions who suffer from it.

Mahatma Gandhi taught us to view our national struggle always in terms of the under-privileged and those to whom opportunity had been denied. Therefore, there was always an economic facet to our political struggle for freedom. We realized that there was no real freedom for those who suffered continually from want, and because there were millions who lacked the barest necessities of existence in India, we thought of freedom in terms of raising and bettering the lot of these people. Having achieved political freedom, it is our passionate desire to serve our people in this way and to remove the many burdens they have carried for generations past. Gandhi said on one occasion that it was his supreme ambition to wipe every tear from every eye. That was an ambition beyond even his power to realize, for many millions of eyes have shed tears in India, in Asia and in the rest of the world; and perhaps it may never be possible completely to stop this unending flow of human sorrow. But it is certainly possible for us to lessen human want and misery and suffering; and what are politics and all our arguments worth if they do not have this aim in view.

We live in an age of paradox and continuing crisis. We talk of peace and prepare for war. We discuss internationalism and One World and yet narrow nationalisms govern our activities. There is said to be a conflict of ideologies and this argument and the conflict that flows from it usually take place without much thought of the ideals and objectives that should govern us. We move from one temporary expedient to another, never catching up with the pace of events. Priding ourselves on shaping history, we function

from day to day as slaves of the events that inexorably unroll themselves before our eyes and fear possesses us and hatred follows in its train.

None of us, especially those who have to shoulder the burden of responsibility, can ignore the realities and dangers of the moment. We cannot live in an idealistic world of our own creation. What we consider the immediate reality might only be a passing phase and it may be that we have to look a little deeper in order to understand and control events. The world has made astonishing progress in technology and material advancement. That is all to the good and we must take full advantage of it. But the long course of history of *human development* shows us that there are certain basic truths and realities that do not change with the changing times and unless we hold fast to them we are likely to go astray. The present generation has often gone astray in spite of all the wonderful accumulation of knowledge that we possess and danger always looms ahead.

What, then, is lacking and how can we solve these crises in human affairs? I am no prophet nor have I any magical remedy to suggest. I have tried to grope my way, to think straight and to co-ordinate, as far as possible, action to thought. I have often found it difficult to do so, for action on the political plane is not individual action but group and mass action. Nevertheless, I am convinced that any policy, any ideology, which ignores truth and character in human beings and which preaches hatred and violence, can only lead to evil results. However good our motives may be and however noble the objective we aim at, if the path we follow and the means we adopt are wrong and evil, we can never achieve that objective. If we seek peace we must labour for peace and not for war. If we seek harmony and goodwill among the various peoples of the world, we must not preach or practise hatred. It is true that there is plenty of violence and hatred in the world today and we cannot permit this to triumph, as we cannot submit to any aggression. We have to combat evil and aggression; in doing so, we have to remember not only our aims and objectives but also that the means we adopt should be in conformity with them.

The growth of modern civilization with its magnificent achievements has led more and more to the centralization of authority and power and encroachments continue to be made on the freedom of the individual. Perhaps, to some extent, this is inevitable, as the modern world cannot function without considerable centralization. We have seen, however, this process of centralized authority being carried to such an extreme that individual freedom almost vanishes. The State becomes supreme in everything or groups of individuals have so much concentrated power at their disposal that individual freedom tends to fade away. Different and sometimes hostile ideologies, from their respective points of view, encourage this concentration of power in the State or the group. This must ultimately result not only in human unhappiness but also in a lessening of that creative genius which is so essential for the growth of humanity. We have to find some balance between the centralized authority of the State and the assurance of freedom and opportunity to each individual.

This and like problems will have to be solved in the minds of men before we can mould the shape of things to our liking. What more appropriate place can there be for the consideration of these problems than a university where the rising generation is being trained to take part in the business of life and to shoulder its burdens?

As I stand here in the beautiful campus of this university, surrounded by the peace and beauty of nature and the genius of man, the conflicts and troubles of the world seem far away. The past crowds in upon me, the past of Asia, of Europe and of America and standing on this razor's edge of the present, I try to peep into the future. I see in this past the long struggle of Man against adverse surroundings and in the face of innumerable difficulties. I see his repeated martyrdom and crucifixion but I see also the spirit of man rising again and again and triumphing over every adversity. Let us look at this perspective of history, gain wisdom and courage from it and not be oppressed too much by the burden of the past and of the present. We are the heirs of all these ages that have gone before us and it has been given to us to play our part during a period of great transition in this world. That is a

privilege and a responsibility and we should accept it without fear or apprehension. History tells us of Man's struggle for freedom and in spite of many failures his achievements and successes have been remarkable. True freedom is not merely political but must also be economic and spiritual. Only then can Man grow and fulfil his destiny. That freedom has also to be envisaged today not merely in terms of group freedom often resulting in nations warring against one another but as individual freedom within free national groups in the larger context of world freedom and order. The problems of Asia, of Europe and of America can no longer be dealt with separately; they are parts of a single world problem.

The future appears to be full of conflict and difficulty but I have little doubt that the spirit of Man, which has survived so much, will triumph again.

BASIC WISDOM

M^R CHANCELLOR, Mr Vice-Chancellor and fellow members of the University of Ceylon, I am very grateful to you for the honour you have done me. I do not quite know why I have been singled out from amongst my distinguished colleagues and called upon to speak on this occasion. Nevertheless, I wish, if I may, to express my gratitude to you and through you to others in this pleasant island for their great welcome and for all that they have done for us during our stay here.

This is rather a unique occasion. The mere fact of people from different parts of the Commonwealth and from distant quarters of the world coming together to confer on questions of vital consequence is a matter of significance and a presage of the type of conferences that we may have in the future when more and more people will confer together about the problems of the day, in all earnestness and without regard to those barriers which have separated us in the past.

In the citation about me, I was, I believe, referred to as a person who had profound wisdom and political astuteness. I do not know how far I am politically astute but I must confess to you that the older I grow the more I feel the lack of wisdom in myself. Perhaps, it may be that that very feeling is a sign of having some wisdom.

In the world today, one sees so many things which please one and so many other things which appear to one to be so extraordinarily wrong. One wonders why this world of ours, having every opportunity of co-operating for the progress of humanity, loses itself always in conflict, in violence and in hatred. We see the clash of blind armies, as it were. We see the reproduction in the modern age of something which we thought had been done away with in the past ages. In the past ages, we had in many parts of the world—fortunately not so much in your country or mine—tremendous conflicts on some kind of religious dogma and people fought one another on the interpretation of some dogma. We see, today, people becoming dogmatic in fields other than that of religion and conflicts arising from that dogmatic approach to human affairs.

I should have thought that in the modern world there were many approaches we could have to life's problems but certainly not the narrow-minded, dogmatic approach. We may have a scientist's approach, a humanist's approach and possibly other approaches, too; but the dogmatic approach inevitably narrows the mind and prevents us from seeing much that we ought to see.

In the realm of human affairs as also in international affairs, we find this dogmatic approach bringing in its train conflict, want of understanding, hatred and violence. I do not know how we are to get over this; but unless we get over this narrow-minded approach, I have no doubt that we shall fail to solve the problems of the day.

One of the brighter features of this age is—and I attach a great deal of value to it—that the barriers that separated the so-called East from the so-called West are gradually disappearing. That is a good sign. But, at the same time, other barriers seem to be growing in the East and in the West. We

meet repeatedly in conferences and talk about the problems that face us. Sometimes we solve a problem or two but for each problem that we solve, half a dozen fresh ones crop up.

I remember that somebody made a calculation of the number of international conferences that were held after the conclusion of the First World War and before the commencement of the Second World War. It was a prodigious number. I do not quite know if we have exceeded that number since the Second World War ended.

This is an age of international conferences. A conference is always a good thing or almost always, because people, at any rate, meet round a table and discuss matters with good humour and, even if they do not always succeed in finding a solution, the effort is, nevertheless, always worthy of being made. That in itself results in something that is good. But I have often wondered why there has been this failure in the past to find solutions to our problems. Is it due to a lack of wit in statesmen or to a lack of understanding? I do not think it is either, because they have been able and earnest statesmen desiring peace and co-operation. Even so, somehow or other, solutions have escaped them. Why, then, is it so? I do not know; perhaps, we work too much on the superficial plane, finding solutions to the troubles of the moment and not looking to the deeper causes.

I put this to you for your consideration, because something does come in the way. With all the earnestness we may possess, sometimes we do not get over those old and new barriers that come in the way of mutual understanding. Then, I think that, in spite of our vaunted civilization, in spite of the advance of science and technology, we have lost our grip on some of the basic things of life, something that gives anchorage to life and some standard with which we could measure value.

We have advanced greatly in science—I am a great believer in science—and the scientific approach has changed the world completely. I think that if the world is to solve its problems, it will inevitably have to be through the means of science and not by discarding science. Nevertheless, I find that the sheer advance of science has often enough made

people unscientific. That is an extraordinary thing to say but what I mean is that science has become so vast and all-pervading that scientists are unable to grasp things in their entirety and have become narrower and narrower in each individual subject. They may be very brilliant in some subject but they seem to have no grip on life as a whole.

In the ancient civilizations of India and Greece that one reads about, one has or, at any rate, I have the sensation that people, though much more limited in the knowledge at their disposal, certainly had an integrated view of life. They were not so distracted; they could see life as a whole in spite of the fact that they did not know as much or nearly as much as the average undergraduate knows today. Because of this integrated view of life, they had a certain wisdom in their approach to life's problems.

Whether that is true or not I do not know, because one is apt to endow the past with a certain glamour. It may be that I am wrong but in any event one thing seems to me to be certain, namely, that we of today have no integrated view of life; that we, however clever we may be and however much of facts and knowledge we may have accumulated, are not very wise. We are narrower than the people of old, although every fact has gone to bring us together in this world. We travel swiftly, we have communications, we know more about one another and we have the radio and all kinds of things. In spite of all these widening influences, we are narrower in our minds. That is the extraordinary thing which I cannot understand.

I put this to this gathering of university men, because after all it is for the universities to tackle this problem more than for any other organization. If the universities do not teach some kind of basic wisdom, if they think in terms of producing people with degrees who want certain jobs, then the universities may have, perhaps, solved to a very minor extent the problem of unemployment or provided some technical help or other; but they will not have produced men who can understand or solve the problems of today.

You and I live in Asia. Perhaps, one of the biggest facts of today is this new and changing phase of Asia. What is

happening in Asia is a fact of tremendous historical significance. It is difficult to grasp it entirely or to understand it but I think any person must see that something very big has happened and is happening all over Asia. There is a certain dynamism about it. We do not like much of what is happening and we may like something of what is happening but the fact remains that tremendous and powerful elemental forces are at play in Asia. For us just to sit in our ivory towers and look at them, with dislike or approval, is not good enough. If we wish to play any effective part in this world of ours we have to understand them. For some three or four hundred years, a good part of Asia was under a kind of eclipse and there was a basic urge for political freedom for a long time.

If you read the history of Asia—it is a long, long history—you will find that during the greater part of these thousands of years, Asia has played an important part in world affairs. It is only during the last three or four hundred years that Asia has become static, quiescent and rather stagnant in thought and in action in spite of all the virtues she might have possessed. Naturally and rightly, she fell under the domination of other more progressive, vigorous and dynamic countries. That is the way of the world and that is the right way. If you are static, you must suffer for it. And now, you see a change coming over Asia, and because it is belated the change comes with a rush, upsetting many things and doing many things that one does not like. That this big change is coming over us, however, is a major fact. I do not know—I do not suppose any of you know—what ultimately this change will lead to in Asia.

You and I live in this changing Asia of today. Many of you will have the burden of facing these problems which are not of today or tomorrow but which may last for a generation or more than one generation. The burden is yours because many of us whom you honour are in the afternoon of our lives and have, perhaps, only a few more years to work and labour, which, I am sure, we will do to the best of our capacity and strength. And so, it is for you, young graduates of today, to prepare yourselves in mind and body and, as much as you can, in that deeper wisdom to understand these problems and

to function actively and help in the solution of them. In the world of today, it is not enough for you to take up a distant and academic attitude and look on and just advise others or criticize others. Today, every man has to shoulder his burden. If he does not, well, he falls out; he simply does not count.

I have found many of our young men and women—I am talking more of India than of Ceylon because I do not know much about Ceylon—full of enthusiasm, full of energy, full of earnestness but, if you will permit me to say so, singularly academic or, if you like, singularly cut off from life's realities. During their student days, they often debated and passed resolutions on this subject or that but afterwards, when they went out into the world, they seemed to think that life itself was a continuous debating society where they could pass votes of censure or criticize others without doing much themselves.

Now, that is not a very helpful attitude. Perhaps, it is due to the fact that for the past so many years, most of us did not have much chance of doing anything constructive. Our main job was to fight for the freedom of our country in a destructive way, in an oppositionist way and not in a creative way. The result is that we cannot get rid of this negative and destructive outlook. Instead of helping to build something, we just sit down and criticize others who may be, rightly or wrongly, trying to build. At least, they are trying to build. I think that mere criticism is a very unhelpful and bad attitude to adopt. In whatever country you may be, what is required today is a constructive and creative approach. Certainly there is always something to destroy, something that is bad; but mere destruction is not enough. You must also build.

One thing more. I take it that a university is essentially a place of culture, whatever 'culture' might mean. But that takes me back to where I began. There is a great deal of culture all over the place and I, normally, find that those people who talk most loudly of culture, according to my judgment, possess no culture at all. Culture, first of all, is not loud; it is quiet, it is restrained, it is tolerant. You may judge the culture of a person by his silence, by a gesture, by a

phrase or, more especially, by his life generally. The peculiar, narrow idea of culture that is spreading is that culture depends on the kind of headgear you wear or the kind of food you eat or on similar superficial things which, I do not deny, have a certain importance but which are very secondary in the larger context of life.

Each country has certain special cultural characteristics which have been developed through the ages. Similarly, each age has a culture and a certain way of its own. The cultural characteristics of a country are important and are certainly retained, unless, of course, they do not fit in with the spirit of the age. So, by all means, adhere to the special culture of your nation. But there is something that is deeper than national culture and that is human culture. If you do not have that human culture, that basic culture, then even that national culture of which you may be so proud has no real roots and will not do you much good. Today more especially, it has become essential for us to develop, in addition to such national culture as we may have, something that can only be called a world culture. There is much talk of One World and I believe that, at some time or other, that talk must bear fruit or else this world will go to pieces. It may be that we will not see that One World in our generation but if you want to prepare for that One World you must at least think about it. You have at least a culture to sustain you; and there is no reason why you should live your lives in narrow grooves, trying to think yourselves superior to the rest of the world.

We live surrounded by all kinds of dark fears in this new year. Probably, the prevailing feeling in the world of today is fear. Almost everybody is afraid of something; every country is afraid of some other country and, of course, fear is a thing which leads to all kinds of undesirable consequences. Fear is probably the most evil of sensations and we are living under the dominance of fear. If we could get rid of this fear to some extent, perhaps, it would be far easier for us to solve our problems.

Besides fear, we see in the world a great deal of hope and earnestness and a great deal of expectation of better things

at the same time. We see creative and constructive as well as destructive and negative impulses at work. I do not know which will triumph in the near or the distant future, but obviously it will be impossible for me and impossible for you to function adequately if we do not believe in the ultimate triumph of the creative and unifying processes of the day.

However that may be, even the attempt to work for some great cause not only helps that cause but also helps us. We are not prophets and we do not know what the morrow may bring but it is rather satisfying to work for the morrow of your choice. It brings something into your life which makes it worth while. If you align yourself to some great purpose or to something elemental, it ennobles you. Whether the reward comes or not, the mere fact of working for it is a reward enough.

With all the evil that we see around us and with all its degradation, we have to live in this world. There is, nevertheless, plenty of good in the world and we have to see that there is plenty of what I as a Hindu would call the element of divinity in the individual as well as in the group. If we can have our feet firmly planted on the soil and do not lose ourselves in imaginary vagaries and at the same time have some of that divine fire in us, too, then, perhaps, we might be able to balance ourselves and develop some kind of an integrated life. Somebody has said—and I would like you to feel that way:

Lord, though I live on earth, the child of earth,
yet I was fathered by the starry sky.

I have come to Ceylon after ten years. I have been here on two or three previous occasions also. Whenever I come here, I do not feel that I have come to a strange country—I feel very much at home. Your welcome and the friendly faces that I see everywhere make me feel at home. Quite apart from that, you of Ceylon and we of India are intimately related in our cultural inheritances as you all know very well and it does not make much difference what shape politics takes. You are an independent country, as you should be, so are we an independent country, as we should be. Political barriers should not be allowed to come into play when

culturally our people look to each other. When I come here, I think even more than I normally do—and normally I think a great deal—of that greatest and wisest and brightest son of India, whom you honour greatly and whom all of us in India and many other countries also greatly honour. The bond of the Buddha and all that it stands for is a bond between India and Ceylon which nothing can break. Whenever one thinks of the Buddha, one inevitably thinks of his great teaching; and I often feel that, perhaps, if we think more of that basic teaching of the avoidance of hatred and violence, we may be nearer the solution of our problems.

DYNAMIC LIFE

I AM grateful for the honour you have done me in awarding me this degree. A number of other universities in India have also honoured me in this way; but that has not lessened in any way the value of this particular honour. In my capacity as Prime Minister, honours in various forms have been showered upon me. The affection that has been lavished upon me by the people of this country is, indeed, the greatest honour that can come to anybody. It is overwhelming and makes me feel very humble. No response can, therefore, be adequate enough. All one can do is to utilize all one's strength and energy in furthering the tasks of the country. I think Bernard Shaw once said that the true joy in life is to align oneself with some mighty purpose and not get entangled in petty troubles of which life is so full; to work for the purpose with all the strength and energy that one may have till one is worn out and can be thrown on the scrap heap. Well, I do not know whether it is possible to disentangle oneself completely from the petty troubles of which there is such a great deal. Normally, it would seem to be difficult to live a wholly impersonal life and dedicate it to one mighty purpose; but

sometimes, moments arrive in the history of a country when this can be done—and done not merely by individuals but by large groups. A moment came in the life of this country when a large number of our countrymen aligned themselves to a mighty purpose at the bidding of a very great man—Mahatma Gandhi. These men forgot their personal grievances and ambitions in an overwhelming desire to serve a great purpose and thereby grew in stature themselves. If you try to do great things, the shadow of their greatness partly falls upon you also. If you always dwell on the petty things of life, you inevitably remain petty. And so, in India's fight for freedom, many people of small stature had the high privilege of serving under one of the greatest of men and of being associated with their country's historic struggle.

That, however, is past history. We have to accept the present and think of the future. How shall we shape the present? How are you, young men and women of this University, going to conduct yourselves? I do not know what you have in your minds or what desires and urges influence you. I try to study the millions of faces I see wherever I go and I have seen a good proportion of India's vast population. Although I see them in crowds and in groups, I look into their eyes and try to read what lies behind those eyes. I do this, especially when I meet young men and women, because I am deeply concerned with the future of India which they represent to me. The future of this country ultimately depends on her young men and women, most of whom are in colleges and universities today. I am very anxious to find out what stuff they are made of. They are large in number; but what really counts, if our country is to progress, is the quality of our human material. The future of India does not depend on her numbers or even on her past, except in so far as the future grows out of the present and the present grows out of the past. It is possible for a country to make progress to some extent even with people of mediocre quality. India has a large number of them. Obviously, that is not enough. If a great country like India is to be greater, it is essential for her to have men and women who must be more than mediocre. I have no doubt that you try to play a

good game when you go in for sports. You perhaps run a hundred yards in ten seconds; but if you want to be an athlete of real quality you have to surpass and outdistance others. It makes a lot of difference whether you do a hundred yards in ten seconds or in eleven seconds. The difference is only one second but it is very important. That applies to everything. Is the University of Saugor going to produce men and women of real quality? We produced men and women of quality in the past. Subsequently, however, that quality seemed to have worn off and we became a nation that more or less lived on its inheritance. Of course, nothing is more advantageous and more creditable than a rich heritage; but nothing is more dangerous for a nation than to sit back and live on that heritage. A nation cannot progress if it merely imitates its ancestors; what builds a nation is creative, inventive and vital activity. I seek the creative mind. How do creative minds come to be? In many ways, I suppose. I know that the University of Saugor cannot produce creativeness; but what it can do is to provide an environment in which creativeness and vitality of mind and body have a place and can prosper.

India seems to me an odd mixture of traits and characteristics. Some fill me with joy and faith and others with alarm. I cannot predict which will prosper and which will ultimately win. That, the future will tell. All I can say is that I have a great deal of faith in my country and in my people. At the same time, what is wrong with our country is also quite obvious. We are narrow in mind and vision; we not only lack creativeness of mind but the atmosphere in which it can flourish. I am astonished at the way the word 'culture' is bandied about in India. To me this only means that there is no culture where this is done. Culture is not something that can be bandied about. It does not talk too much and does not shout too much. The other day, I read one of Rabindra Nath Tagore's poems or rather a translation of it, which spoke of the wonderful variety of India where innumerable streams have flowed, producing the culture we now possess. The capacity to absorb these various streams of culture is a part of the creativeness of India. Therefore, there

is no reason why we should adopt the narrow outlook of pride and folly which makes us think that we have everything and that we need receive nothing from outside. South-East Asia and the Far East have borrowed freely from India's cultural inheritance. Similarly, we find evidence of other cultures in India. Of course, the basis of Indian culture remains unchanged even though it has absorbed other cultures. Such was the country of our distant ancestors. Gradually, a change came. We became afraid of others and shrank into ourselves. We did not want either to go out ourselves or to let others come in. We developed narrow grooves of thought and narrow divisions amongst ourselves, each division isolating itself from other castes or groups. We practically imposed a ban on travel abroad. People were afraid they would lose their caste or religion if they went out of India. We came to attach more importance to what we ate, drank or touched than to other far more important aspects of life. The transformation you see now was not sudden—this shrinking into ourselves, this closing of our eyes to all that was going on around us and thinking that what we possessed was everything and that there was nothing more to learn. When an individual or a community starts to think like that, individual or community is doomed because life is an ever growing, dynamic process. No kind of vitality can be static. The moment growth stops, decay sets in and the ultimate result is death. Thus did we in India become static in our life and culture. This process of decay through the centuries can be traced in our literature. We start with magnificent literature. Then we come to classical Sanskrit, which is also very beautiful. However, it gradually deteriorates and we reach a stage when Sanskrit comes to be written in long involved sentences, sometimes even running to two pages. There is no strength or vitality left in it. Interpretations and explanations bear testimony to the decay of the language. Instead of being inspired by great ideas, we have even lost what we had. Our old architecture was magnificent and was, perhaps, among the greatest architectures of the world. See, how it became degraded! It still retained its craftsmanship but the nobility of design

that had come from simplicity was gone. It became heavier and heavier. There was no dignity in it, only hard work. When a country is dynamic, it reveals itself in a myriad activities. We hope to be dynamic again. Perhaps, it was necessary for us to learn a lesson before we became dynamic once more.

What inspiration can we draw from something which is static and half dead? That is the question. I am amazed that people should function in such a narrow way that they should shut their minds and demand that others shut their minds too, against everything new and talk only of Indian culture. I know something about culture. Those who preach that doors should be shut do not know anything of culture. Every process of exclusion means lack of culture; every process of inclusion indicates growth. Those elements that believe in pushing things away narrow the mind and the nation falls back to a period of static culture. We have to be dynamic or else we cannot survive.

Do you realize what tremendous changes have come over the world in the last few generations? I want you to think about it. Take India, for instance. A man of Asoka's or Akbar's time, looking at India as it was about 150 years ago, would have found changes, of course; but he would not have found any basic change. The pattern of human life was much the same. The horse still remained the chief means of transport and communication. It was so for thousands of years. Suddenly—and chiefly due to the application of science—a great change came. It is amazing how the development in communications alone has upset the world. Even that is not enough to make one realize how far science has gone! You may have been static five hundred years ago but nobody can be static today. Everything is changing. The pace and tempo of the change is terrific. Incidentally, one of the good things we have done in the past five years is that, in order to get in touch with the rapid scientific changes, we have set up a number of national laboratories. To remain static is bad, because for a country to remain so means stagnation and stagnation is something which leads to extinction. Besides, it is not even possible today. It might have

been possible years ago when change was slow and when the rest of the world did not impinge upon you.

To be dynamic and creative is the practical policy or the higher view of culture. It is fatal to sink into narrowness of mind in spite of the fact that India has had a tremendously rich inheritance. How many of you have that dynamic approach and how many of you are thinking in terms of getting jobs here and there under the Government? Whether you go into Government service or take up any other occupation, what is your ideal? Just to earn a few hundred rupees? Or is it to achieve something creative and good? Are you just dragging on an unworthy existence for a number of years and doing nothing else? That is a big question facing India. Whatever our virtues and failings—and a long list can be prepared of both—I believe in facing life in an adventurous way, in meeting life more than half way without making a noise and without shouting. Whether Nature adapts itself to you or you to Nature ultimately depends on whether your approach to life and to its problems is going to be an adventurous and active one or a static one. What is your ambition? What I seek in the eyes of the innumerable men and women when I go round the country is great and high ambition to do great things. Sometimes, I see some eyes which rather thrill me; there is something of quality in them. The more I see such eyes or faces, the more I am assured of the future, which depends on the men and women who have the spirit of adventure and who do not flinch from difficulty. I hope the University of Saugor will produce such men and women.

THIS BEAUTIFUL WORLD OF OURS

DEAR CHILDREN:

Shankar asked me to write something for the Children's Number of his Weekly. In a weak moment, thinking more of the children than of the Weekly, I promised to write. But I soon realized that I had made a rash promise. What was I to write about?

I like being with children and talking to them and, even more, playing with them. For a moment I forget that I am terribly old and that it is a very long time ago since I was a child. But when I sit down to write to you, I cannot forget my age and the distance that separates you from me. Old people have a habit of delivering sermons and good advice to the young. I remember that I disliked this very much long long ago when I was a boy. So, I suppose you do not like it very much either. Grown-ups have also a habit of appearing to be very wise, even though very few of them possess much wisdom. I have not quite made up my mind yet whether I am wise or not. Sometimes, listening to others, I feel I must be very wise and brilliant and important. Then, looking at myself, I begin to doubt this. In any event, people who are wise do not talk about their wisdom and do not behave as if they were very superior persons.

So, I must not give you a string of good advice as to what you should do and what you should not do. I suppose you have enough of this from your teachers and others. Nor must I presume to be a superior person.

What then shall I write about? If you were with me, I would love to talk to you about this beautiful world of ours, about flowers and trees and birds and animals and stars and mountains and glaciers and all the other wonderful things

that surround us in this world. We have all this beauty around us and yet we, who are grown-ups, often forget about it and lose ourselves in our offices and imagine that we are doing very important work.

I hope you will be more sensible and open your eyes and ears to this beauty and life that surround you. Can you recognize the flowers by their names and the birds by their singing? How easy it is to make friends with them and with everything in nature, if you go to them affectionately and with friendship. You must have read many fairy tales and stories of long ago. But the world itself is the greatest fairy tale and story of adventure that has ever been written. Only, we must have eyes to see and ears to hear and a mind that opens out to the life and beauty of the world.

Grown-ups have a strange way of putting themselves in compartments and groups. They build up barriers and then they think that those outside their particular barrier are strangers whom they must dislike. There are barriers of region, of caste, of colour, of party, of nation, of province, of language, of custom and of wealth and poverty. Thus, they live in prisons of their own making. Fortunately, children do not know much about these barriers which separate. They play or work with one another and it is only when they grow up that they begin to learn about these barriers from their elders. I hope you will take a long time in growing up.

I have recently been to the United States of America, to Canada and to England. It was a long journey, right on the other side of the world. I found the children there very like the children here and so I easily made friends with them and, whenever I had the chance, I played with them a little. That was much more interesting than many of my talks with the grown-ups. For children everywhere are much the same; it is the grown-ups who imagine they are very different and deliberately make themselves so.

Some months ago, the children of Japan wrote to me and asked me to send them an elephant. I sent them a beautiful elephant on behalf of the children of India. This elephant came from Mysore and travelled all the way by sea to Japan. When it reached Tokyo, thousands and thousands of children

came to see it. Many of them had never seen an elephant. This noble animal thus became a symbol of India to them and a link between them and the children of India. I was very happy that this gift of ours gave so much joy to so many children of Japan and made them think of our country. So, we must also think of their country and of the many other countries in the world and remember that everywhere there are children like you going to school and play, sometimes quarrelling but always making friends again. You can read about these countries in your books and when you grow up, many of you will visit them. Go there as friends and you will find friends to greet you.

You know that we had a very great man amongst us. He was called Mahatma Gandhi. But we used to call him affectionately Bapuji. He was very wise but he did not show off his wisdom. He was simple and childlike in many ways and he loved children. He was a friend of everybody and everybody, peasant or worker, poor man or rich man, came to him and found a friendly welcome. He was a friend not only to all the people of India but also to all the people in the rest of the world. He taught us not to hate anybody, not to quarrel but to play with one another and to co-operate in the service of our country. He taught us also not to be afraid of anything and to face the world cheerfully and with laughter.

Our country is a very big country and there is a great deal to be done by all of us. If each one of us does his or her little bit, then all this mounts up and the country prospers and goes ahead fast.

I have tried to talk to you in this letter as if you were sitting near me and I have written more than I intended.

CHILDREN OF THE WORLD

WHAT a troublesome person Shankar is! Every few days I get a reminder from him that I must write something for the Children's Number or else he himself appears and looks at me with reproachful eyes. Here I am trying hard to get through a great deal of work before I leave for England and on top of this I am expected to write articles! Shankar seems to forget that most of my writing has been done in the leisure of prison. Since I came out of that small prison and entered the larger prison of office, my freedom to read and write has been taken away from me. I cannot do many of the things that I would like to do and I have to do much that I intensely dislike.

I suppose Shankar knows all this but he has got an idea into his head that something from me must appear in the Children's Number. Well, I am bound to confess that I like the idea of a Children's Number very much and I should like to help it grow. I liked the last number and I am almost sure that the next number will be better. What pleases me most of all is the great interest that children in distant countries have taken in this venture. I was surprised and delighted to visit an exhibition where hundreds of pictures and cartoons sent for Shankar's Children's Number were exhibited.

As I looked at these pictures, I thought of the vast army of children all over the world, outwardly different in many ways, speaking different languages, wearing different kinds of clothes and yet so very like one another. If you bring them together, they play or quarrel. But even their quarrelling is some kind of play. They do not think of differences amongst themselves, differences of class or caste or colour or status. They are wiser than their fathers and mothers. As they grow up, unfortunately, their natural wisdom is often eclipsed by the teaching and behaviour of their elders. At school they learn many things which are no doubt useful but they gradually forget that the essential thing is to be human and

kind and playful and to make life richer for ourselves and others. We live in a wonderful world that is full of beauty and charm and adventure. There is no end to the adventures that we can have if only we seek them with our eyes open. So many people seem to go about their life's business with their eyes shut. Indeed, they object to other people keeping their eyes open. Unable to play themselves, they dislike the play of others.

Our own country is a little world in itself with an infinite variety and places for us to discover. I have travelled a great deal in this country and I have grown in years. And yet I have not seen many parts of the country we love so much and seek to serve. I wish I had more time, so that I could visit the odd nooks and corners of India. I would like to go there in the company of bright young children whose minds are opening out with wonder and curiosity as they make new discoveries. I should like to go with them, not so much to the great cities of India as to the mountains and the forests and the great rivers and the old monuments, all of which tell us something of India's story. I would like them to discover for themselves that they can play about in the snow in some parts of India and also see other places where tropical forests flourish. Such a trip with children would be a voyage of discovery of the beautiful trees of our forests and hillsides and the flowers that grace the changing seasons and bring life and colour to us. We would watch the birds and try to recognize them and make friends with them. But the most exciting adventure would be to go to the forests and see the wild animals, both the little ones and the big. Foolish people go with a gun and kill them and thus put an end to something that was beautiful. It is far more interesting and amusing to wander about without a gun or any other weapon and to find that wild animals are not afraid and can be approached. Animals have keener instincts than man. If a man goes to them with murder in his heart, they are afraid of him and run away. But if he has any love for animals, they realize that he is a friend and do not mind him. If you are full of fear yourself then the animal is afraid, too, and might attack you in self-defence. The fearless person is seldom, if ever, attacked.

Perhaps, that lesson might be applied to human beings also. If we meet other people in a friendly way, they also become friendly. But if we are afraid of them or if we show our dislike to them, then they behave in the same manner.

These are simple truths which the world has known for ages. But even so, the world forgets and the people of one country hate and fear the people of another country; and because they are afraid, they are sometimes foolish enough to fight each other.

Children should be wiser. At any rate, the children who read Shankar's Children's Number are expected to be more sensible.

THE PRESS AND INDO-PAKISTAN DIFFERENCES

GENTLEMEN, I am happy to have this opportunity of meeting you, the representatives of the press in India and Pakistan. This is a rather remarkable occasion, for the editors of Pakistan and India are meeting to confer together. Whatever we may think of the virtues and failings of the press, it is obvious that it plays a very important part in our lives; it moulds people's minds and thoughts and thus affects the policies of the Government, if not always directly. Therefore, when we have to deal with any major problem, it is important that the press should—if I may say so with all humility—give the right lead. We have developed a fairly widespread and effective press both in India and Pakistan. Perhaps, it is not as good as it might be, though it is fast improving. When I say it is not as good as it might be, what I mean is that it has not yet adjusted itself to the changed conditions in the two independent countries. Of course, it is always difficult for a government or an independent party or for the press to adjust itself to times such as the present.

In India—and I am sure that must apply equally to Pakistan—many people, though they talk a great deal about the independence of their country, do not quite live up to the fact. Old habits of thought which developed when we were under British rule still persist; old suspicions and old ways of looking at things still continue. Many of the editorials which I read today might well have been written about ten years ago—regardless of the fact that India and Pakistan are independent countries. The editorials on our foreign policy and domestic policy, for instance, are governed far too much by our old mental habits and suspicions. Naturally, we are all governed by our old habits and reactions, and we have

not yet been able to adapt ourselves to the new scheme of things.

Now, this applies as much to political parties as it applies to the press. Take, for instance, the great organization in which I have had the honour of working for the greater part of my life—the Indian National Congress. For twenty or thirty years, we functioned as a party or something more than a party in opposition to British rule. Our movement for political freedom was carried out on a big scale and, ultimately, we succeeded in achieving freedom on the political plane. The thirty years of our struggle for independence were a particular kind of experience; we became accustomed to opposition, to struggle, to fighting and to looking at the picture from the point of view of a semi-revolutionary organization which sometimes became wholly revolutionary. We trained our people in certain methods of action. They were more or less peaceful but they were effective and in a sense revolutionary. Of course, we trained large numbers of people to deal with the masses of men and women so that the latter would not be frightened. But that was not exactly the training that was required of us subsequently in the running of our Government and in the running of a constructive machinery in the country. So, we come up against the difficulty that all our training has been of a particular type. It was certainly good training, because it built up character and strength. Nonetheless, it was deficient in some ways. Our old habits of thought still persist and the average man in the street cannot fully realize that the country is now run by his own Government and that it is part of him. Thus, people treat the present Government more or less in the way they treated the British Government. That is what I call a carry-over from the old days.

Also, people treat international problems more or less as we treated them before we became independent. Our international outlook in the old days was fundamentally anti-imperialist; the British Empire in India was the big symbol of imperialism and our attitude was one of anti-imperialism. Of course, now, too, it continues to be one of anti-imperialism on the world stage. Nevertheless, I do find,

often enough, that the old and rather limited viewpoint still governs our attitude towards world problems.

I am mentioning this to you, because it affects the press, perhaps, even more than it affects the average man in the street. In such matters, the press gives the lead which gradually sinks into people's minds. A person forms his opinion about distant occurrences by the news he gets from the press. Very few individuals are competent enough to know the facts or form an opinion independently. They are naturally guided by what the press says.

You know very well that the last two and a half years, since India and Pakistan achieved independence, have been very abnormal years and in many ways very bad years for us, bad in the sense that there has been continuous conflict and continuous suspicion. In fact, there have been major upheavals. Obviously, the press is not responsible for the major upheavals. In due course, historians will give their verdict as to who is responsible. But the fact remains that we have been contending all this time, not only against physical effects, occurrences and incidents but also against something intangible, which is, all the same, very evident. We have been working in a background of fear and sometimes of hatred and suspicion. There is a desire to cause injury to the other party, even though that injury may recoil on us and cause injury to us instead. That, obviously, is an atmosphere which is very bad for any country to live in and that atmosphere, if it continues, poisons not only the relations between the two countries but also the lives of the people in the two countries. Even now, we have not quite escaped the ill effects of this atmosphere.

Some recent events, more especially the talks which I have had with the Prime Minister of Pakistan, have resulted in an agreement which has produced a very marked change in the tense atmosphere. This change was immediately reflected, to a large extent, in the press of the two countries. This is, indeed, remarkable. I have often sat down and thought about how it happened. If we analyse the Agreement, we may not like some of its clauses; but the fact remains that the really important thing is not the contents of

the Agreement but the fact that it came about. Its real importance is not in its details but in the fact that there has been an agreement—an agreement of the right type.

It is clear that the reaction to the Agreement represents a certain urge and desire in the people's minds. Large numbers of people were rather afraid of what was happening and wanted an escape, a way of putting an end to the existing bitterness. They were frustrated; but they could not do anything. In fact, no individual could do anything when millions were moved by passion and fear. But, as soon as a way was found, there was a powerful reaction which showed that the basic feelings and urges of the people of India and Pakistan were essentially against the continuance of the poisonous atmosphere. Everywhere there was a desire to seize on anything that brought security and peace of mind to them. In spite of this we have obviously not solved our problems—what is more, we are not going to solve them suddenly. Nevertheless, the fact that there is a very healthy desire in the minds of the people is, in itself, a most hopeful sign.

Now, the first thing that we should be clear about in our minds is what exactly our aims are. Speaking as the Prime Minister of this country, I should say that our domestic aim is the elimination of poverty and the economic advancement of the people. In this matter, not only Pakistan and India but also the other countries of Asia are alike, because their view of world conditions is dominated by the urge for the primary necessities of life for their people.

In Europe and in America there are many problems. Europe suffered very greatly in the last war and many countries there were reduced to a state of utter ruin. Nevertheless, generally speaking, the problems that face Europe are not essentially those of fulfilling the primary necessities, such as food, clothing, shelter and so on. In India as also in Pakistan, however, we cannot afford to preoccupy ourselves with international affairs. I suppose we will have to play some part in them but our first problem is to feed our people, to clothe them, to educate them and to give them shelter.

These problems, normally speaking, were solved in

Europe long ago. Now that their problems are more or less solved, the people have time and energy to think of other problems and other countries. For instance, take what is called power politics. Power politics has existed in the world ever since organized nations came to exist. There has been power politics in Europe in varying degrees, and now that their essential needs are largely satisfied, the European people are able to move on to other spheres and let their minds range over wider fields.

Europe and America, having passed the first stage, are likely to be concerned more with the second stage, while we in Asia are still at the first stage, that of fulfilling the primary necessities. The second stage will come to us, too; we cannot avoid it; we are thinking about it. We are, probably, not quite so excited about the second stage as the people of America and Europe. Clearly, Pakistan and India have something in common and yet we have to face the fact that a tremendous mental barrier has arisen between the two countries.

Now, what are we to do about it? Let us forget the present and look ten or twenty years ahead. Unless we have a clear picture of what we are aiming at, we shall simply drift about, not knowing where we are going. We should always aim at something definite. Of course, we may be pushed about from place to place or be forced by factors beyond our control to do things we do not consider advantageous. Nevertheless, we as a government, we as a people—and that includes the press—must have some general idea of what we propose to do, leaving aside domestic or economic improvement. Are we going to encourage continuous conflict between India and Pakistan? Are we looking forward to a stage when a conflict will become inevitable; ought we to prepare for it or do we feel that a conflict is not inevitable, that a conflict is disastrous and that it should be avoided?

True, as a Prime Minister, I must take every precaution to protect my country, to ensure that my country is not attacked, that aggression does not take place and that the country is not placed in a difficult position. Every government has got

to do that. No doubt, the Government of Pakistan has also to do that. That is admitted. But do you think that a conflict is inevitable? Today, some people think that a third world war is inevitable and they prepare for it. They do not like war; most people in the world do not want war. Nevertheless by pressure of circumstances they talk about it and prepare for it, terrible preparations for armament go on and fear spreads everywhere. Are we going to take it that, whatever the consequences, a conflict between India and Pakistan is inevitable in the nature of things?

Let me put it to you that it is a very serious thing. If we have the fear of conflict in our minds, then inevitably all our actions and all our thoughts will be governed by that and we can never really get out of it, because something that we may do in India will have reactions in Pakistan and something that they do in Pakistan will react on us. The smallest incidents, which would otherwise go unnoticed, will assume undue significance and become part of a larger picture.

One of the big things that the gentlemen of the newspaper world must realize is that Asia, after nearly 300 years, has turned the corner. Every country in Asia is today passing through a stage of transition. None of these countries is strong enough in the economic sense or in any other sense to pose as a great Power. Sometimes, people talk as if India were a big Power. Although we are not, we have the potentialities of a big Power. It is mostly tall talk. We have got rid of certain encumbrances; we have the road clear, more or less, provided we do not destroy ourselves by getting involved in internecine quarrels.

Their geographical position being what it is, India and Pakistan cannot help playing an important role in Asia. If India and Pakistan follow more or less a common policy, it will make a big difference today. If India and Pakistan follow a contrary policy and are opposed to each other, they will obviously be neutralizing each other and cannot play that role. Any common sense approach to the matter shows that India and Pakistan can only do great harm to both.

It may disable them for a generation and render them incapable of making the progress which is so necessary if they

are to play a larger role in Asian and world affairs. This seems to be quite correct logically. It is true, I think, that India and Pakistan, from the standpoint of geography, history, culture and economics, are so connected that normally they should co-operate with each other in the fullest measure. We should try to develop a common approach to foreign policy, defence and many other things; we should come closer together in regard to these policies and co-operate. That would be the natural course for the two countries.

I am perfectly convinced in my own mind that, unless some catastrophe were to overwhelm us, this is inevitable. Because of our very close contacts we cannot be indifferent to each other. We can either be more than friends or become more than enemies.

When individual or group contacts are broken, inevitably hostility and bitterness are produced. What has happened here? A closer contact is bound to come about because it is to the advantage of both; I speak of sheer opportunism and not idealism at all. Therefore, I say it is quite inevitable. How it is to happen I do not know but everything points to that end; and in spite of all the terrible experiences we have had during the last two and a half years, every approach of logic and reasonable talk leads to this conclusion and every other approach contrary to this leads to something which is very dangerous for Pakistan and for India. It may take a generation for us to make good. This conflict and wasteful effort will wipe us out from the face of the earth. The natural conclusion is that we should try our utmost to develop friendliness and not do anything which is contrary to the whole course of our history and to the modern currents in the world.

Ultimately, we cannot go against the currents of history. I am quite sure of the desire of our people and so I have arrived at this conclusion. It is clear that, though we may have been partitioned and divorced from each other, our own historical, cultural and other contacts—geographical, economic and other—are so fundamental that, despite everything that happened and despite passion and prejudice and

even gross inhumanity, ultimately the basic ties will survive. These are the things that will keep us together, unless India and Pakistan prove to be backward even culturally. Then, of course, all this will have only been talk and nothing else. If India and Pakistan do not ultimately come together they will only prove that they have no cultural standards to maintain. We may talk a great deal about national culture, Muslim culture and Hindu culture; but those who talk most often know least about it.

We have recently faced a very difficult, critical and painful situation—I refer to West and East Bengal and Assam and partly to other places—and, as I said in another place, we just managed to save ourselves from falling over the edge of the precipice and are now beginning to turn in a different direction. This turning was remarkable, although it is true that many terrible evils still continue. Problems are not solved by merely looking in a different direction. Millions of people have been uprooted and have greatly suffered; and it is no good trying to be over-optimistic. I am talking about the point of view, if you like, of sheer opportunism for a practical, objective approach to our problems. We do not want to be swept away by the passion of the moment but we must realize that passion does exist. We have gone through painful experiences and, even now, tens of thousands of people are going through painful experiences. The exodus is continuing and those who have stayed behind have not, obviously, got rid of the fear that oppresses them. How are we to meet the situation?

There can be three ways of meeting it. One is to think that this kind of thing will go on happening and nothing will stop it. We simply go from one disaster to another as the culmination in a Greek tragedy. We cannot prevent it; therefore, we simply accept it. The other way is, since reason and logic point in that direction, that we must try our best in the faith that we will succeed. I do not mean that we should minimize the dangers; nevertheless, we must go in the direction of peace and co-operation and try to root out the fear that dwells in the minds of millions of people. There is also a third attitude. 'It is good to have peace and co-operation; but we

do not see it anywhere—not much of it, at any rate. We do not think that this attempt will succeed at all. We are prepared to see how it works. We will wait and see what happens.’

I confess that, constituted as I am, I dislike intensely this kind of negative, passive approach—the third one. I can quite understand full-blooded opposition and bear with people who say ‘we cannot have peace: why talk about it?’ I disagree with them of course but I can understand their attitude. What I cannot understand and have no sympathy for is the weak approach. For us to watch and wait and see when powerful forces are at work is characteristic of the weak approach. This is not the approach which a strong nation or a strong man takes with regard to vital problems. Besides, I think, it is an approach which takes you nowhere.

I, personally, have arrived at the conclusion that we should have a strong approach, a positive approach, a constructive approach and an approach which has behind it, in spite of every difficulty, a large measure of faith and confidence. If I have that confidence, if you have that confidence, it will spread to millions of other people. I am no prophet, I am no astrologer to say what the future will be. But I can govern my actions to a large extent and I do not see why I should be passive and be pushed about. If I consider my policy to be right, I propose to follow it to the best of my ability and strength. Having had a fair measure of experience for 30 to 35 years of my life, not so much of governmental ways of working but of mass feeling, of how the masses feel and move, I am not afraid of the masses. I have always had a large measure of faith and confidence in the masses of people, whoever they are. If I have put my confidence in them, they have been good enough to respond by placing their confidence in me. Therefore, I approach this problem, not with doubt, not idealistically, not weakly but having come to this logical, opportunist conclusion.

How are we to go about this? We have to approach the problem keeping in view the basic thing—the general atmosphere. How far we can change it is a very important factor. The second thing is how far we can implement the

various details connected with it. With regard to the basic feeling, let us take East Bengal. The minority community, the Hindus in East Bengal, are obviously frightened. They feel they have no security of life. Therefore, they feel like coming away and I can understand their position.

This also applies to the minority community in West Bengal and we might add that a large number of Muslims have gone away from U.P. and Rajasthan also. I entirely understand this because they are frightened. Maybe, the fear was not justified; but the fact is that they have gone. We have really to face a fear complex. Fear is a terrible thing; it is the worst possible thing that can happen to people because it is infectious. How are we to get rid of this fear? I do not mind if people want to go away from one country to another. But let them not be driven out by fear; let them not go because life is insecure and they do not know what the morrow will bring. How can we remove fear? The Government at the top and the large number of officials can do a good deal. But, obviously, the press can do a great deal more. Until fear is overcome, this problem will not be solved. You saw the tremendous upheaval in the Punjab in August 1947; first in West Punjab and then in other areas, terrible things happened. Massacres took place on a vast scale; you saw elemental forces at work. No government could have either created or controlled it. That particular upheaval stopped but fear continued. You saw the exodus of population from Sind and East Bengal continuing, not because any major incident had happened there, not because there was any killing but because of fear. Sometimes, there might have been economic pressure. Anyhow, by and large, things were settling down, when this situation developed in Bengal.

Again we see a large scale exodus on both sides and fear at work. There is no end to it yet. Not only in Bengal but elsewhere also. This is an impossible situation. So, we have to instil confidence in the minorities. We have to make the majority feel that it is not only their responsibility, it is not only their duty, it is not only for their good name and credit that they have to try and expel fear from the hearts of the minorities but also from the point of view of the narrowest

opportunism. If they fail, everybody will suffer.

The large numbers of refugees and evacuees who have been pushed out of their homes need a lot of sympathy. When they go to a new place and find no employment, they begin to bear grudges and want to revenge themselves on others. This feeling spreads. I think we must, first of all, resolve that every effort will be made to check the forces that spread the fear that pushed out the minorities from where they were, whether in any part of East Pakistan or West Pakistan or India.

Many things have happened, including the enactment of evacuee laws. Normally speaking, all these Acts are justified. Then, there is the increasing fear in the minds of the minority communities. It affects the whole atmosphere. I do not suppose it is reasonable that the millions who have come away should go back but a considerable number may still go back. In any case, it is essential that conditions of security must be created.

As I said, a major change in the atmosphere is necessary. I do not wish to suppress facts; I do not wish to distort facts; but, nevertheless, you can always put the matter in a way so as not to inflame the public mind. Every single factor that frightens the minority community should be analysed as far as possible and fear removed. If the economic conditions affect them, you must analyse them. If the housing conditions affect them, you should analyse them. You are asking the migrants to go back. Obviously, when they go back, they must have their houses. We must give back their houses. There is also the working of the permit system and so many other things. All these matters should be considered all over India, Pakistan, Eastern Pakistan, Western Pakistan, Sind and so on.

As I said, the problem of evacuee property somehow affects people more vitally. Personally, if I may say so, I have never had any strong feeling about property. In fact, generally speaking, I dislike the system of property or too much of property for an individual. But I do see that people attach more importance to property than even to their lives. Where property questions are involved, they become more

excited than when problems of life and death are involved. Therefore, if we could deal with the property questions in a reasonable way, if we could deal with them in an equitable way, it would go a long way to solve many of our problems.

Take the matter of the canal waters. It is a problem which is eminently suitable for adjustment by both the parties. If we solve our problems by adjustment, if we could try our best to remove fear, to make the majority feel that it is their duty to protect the minorities in their own interest and remove fear from the minds of the minorities and remove all those little pinpricks that affect them, I think you will find the situation changing radically. If we are honest, we must remove not only fear but the other difficulties also. This involves the happiness of a vast number of people and has become a question of good name for India and Pakistan; their futures are involved and if the problem of the minorities is not solved, the trouble in both countries will go on multiplying.

Well, I have ventured to place before you my ideas frankly and I hope that you, who wield such a great deal of influence through your newspapers, will use your influence in solving our problems and removing the sense of insecurity in the minority communities. Big things are happening in the world and big things will happen. A month ago, there was mounting tension between India and Pakistan and there was a possibility of conflict. People became afraid that the trouble might spread to other parts of the world; and then India and Pakistan ceased to be of much value in world affairs as they were wrapped up in their own problems. When this Agreement was concluded, it raised high hopes and the world saw that we would not be swept off our feet and that we were capable of steering ourselves away from disaster.

In this context, we immediately became more important than we were when we were tied up with our own difficulties. So, we must work the Agreement to the advantage of both India and Pakistan. There are things in which Pakistan can, in some ways, help India and India can help Pakistan similarly. There is nothing that should come in the way of

India or Pakistan helping each other.

I hope your talks will lead to the removal of such differences as there are between India and Pakistan. We should have correspondents of newspapers going from one country to another and the difficulties that have arisen should be removed; it doesn't matter if bad news comes. All possible obstructions should be removed. I also hope that some machinery will be evolved by which newspapermen of both countries will be able to discuss their problems jointly and, ultimately, create the atmosphere which is so essential.

FREEDOM AND LICENCE

MR PRESIDENT and friends, you have referred to me and addressed me as Prime Minister and, perhaps, you have also invited me in that capacity. Nevertheless, I would like to speak to you, not as Prime Minister, although I cannot be rid of that fact, but informally, as friends meeting together in earnest converse to consider difficult and baffling problems, for we do meet under the stress of heavy circumstances today.

Now, if this is so, it is easy enough for us or for anybody else to start criticizing people and condemning nations. But the whole point is: what are we driving at? If we have a clear objective before us, are we going towards it by what we say or do or are we moving away from it? That is the test. In normal times, it does not much matter—within limits, of course—what one says or does, because it cannot do very much harm; and even if it does harm, we can always pull ourselves together. But in times of crisis, in times of grave emergency, what is said or done does matter very much; a wrong word or a wrong action may have very far-reaching results.

The press, it is repeatedly said, performs a very essential function in our lives today, especially in the life of democratic

countries. In other places, that function is performed under authoritarian direction, while in democratic countries it is supposed to say just what it likes within the limitations of the law which are—I must say—pretty wide. Now, this is a tremendous burden. The burden, of course, is inevitable when power or privilege comes to a group. We won our independence and we take pride in it. But, obviously, independence or freedom is not a one-sided affair; it carries enormous responsibilities, such as that of defending that independence when it is attacked—defending it, not only from external attack but, what is even more important, from an internal weakening.

After all, the thing that a nation must beware of—more than external danger—is internal rot. Freedom carries with it the obvious responsibility, which every one realizes, of defending it from external attack. But, ultimately, the other responsibility is more important and that is to maintain the inner strength, the morale, the self-confidence of a nation, which can be done only by following what I roughly call the right advice and, more especially, developing the habit of dispassionate thought and the calm consideration of problems. This becomes even more important in times of crisis, when people are apt to become excited and hysterical and are inclined to believe every vague rumour.

Newspapers are, of course, of all kinds and in India there are thousands of them. There are responsible newspapers; there are newspapers which are sometimes responsible, sometimes not; there are newspapers which are more irresponsible than responsible; and there are some sheets which seem to excel only in flights of imagination and other acts of irresponsibility. Fortunately, the latter are not important. In the old days, it was or at least was thought to be the function of the Government to suppress the newspapers that had an evil tendency, in the opinion of the Government. That, of course, is an utterly wrong approach, because you cannot cure the evil by trying to suppress it.

What, then, are we to do? For, sometimes, the evil may grow and become dangerous to public welfare. Obviously, the right way is for an organization like yours to interest

itself in it directly, not, of course, in the sense of punishing people—there is no question of punishing—but of forming such a strong body of opinion among those who are responsible for the newspapers that any back-slider can be pulled up; or, at any rate, it can be made known to the public that the person concerned is a back-slider and is not acting rightly. I think that is very important, because while on the one hand the main organs of the Indian press have shown a fairly high standard of responsibility in dealing with news or situations generally, on the other there are some periodicals which amaze me by their utter irresponsibility. No doubt, people read them and, no doubt, they are affected by them. How are we going to deal with this matter? It concerns the wider question of privilege and power having to bear responsibility. Mr Stanley Baldwin, the Prime Minister of England, once became angry with the press in England and said that the press had the harlot's privilege and power without responsibility. That was an extreme way of putting the matter but the point is that when we have power or right, inevitably an obligation follows that right. You cannot separate the two.

We, who have been fighting for our rights and have finally achieved them, are apt to forget that a right by itself is incomplete and, in fact, cannot last long if the obligations which accompany that right are forgotten by the nation or by a greater part of it. Whether as individuals or citizens or groups, we still think too much in terms of rights and privileges and too little in terms of obligations. That weakens a nation and we become then merely critics and complain without anything constructive to contribute. That applies to the nation as a whole but much more so to the press. That is to say, the press fought for its own freedom from governmental interference in the old days and, gradually, step by step it has achieved wider freedom. I think I can say that whatever our other failings might be—by 'our' I mean the Government's—at the present moment the amount of freedom of expression that is allowed to or indulged in by the press can hardly be exceeded in any country in the world. I shall be quite frank with you. Much that appears because

of that freedom seems to me exceedingly dangerous. To my mind, the freedom of the press is not just a slogan from the larger point of view but it is an essential attribute of the democratic process. I have no doubt that even if the Government dislikes the liberties taken by the press and considers them dangerous, it is wrong to interfere with the freedom of the press. By imposing restriction you do not change anything; you merely suppress the public manifestation of certain things, thereby causing the idea and thought underlying them to spread further. Therefore, I would rather have a completely free press with all the dangers involved in the wrong use of that freedom than a suppressed or regulated press.

Without responsibility, freedom gradually becomes something very near licence. Licence is a vague word and I do not like it; but it is being used in this connection and I can think of no better word at the moment. Licence ultimately means mental disintegration; and if there is mental disintegration in the body politic, obviously it affects every limb of it. That applies to the newspapers also. If, with the freedom they have, the element of licence and utter irresponsibility increases then not only will it endanger their freedom but injure their reputation. We should have freedom by all means but we should try to maintain a certain integrity of approach in public activities, including the press. Of course, we know that newspapermen and journalists of the past and in the present have laid down in high terms what the press should be and I have no doubt that responsible newspapermen, at any rate, are always trying to reach that standard. Anyhow, it seems to me that the only right approach to it is for newspapermen and their organization to tackle the problem and it is not within the competence of an external agency to do so, even though that is the Government. They should raise their standards themselves, not by punishment—because they are not an executive branch of the Government—but by making it clear to their erring brethren that what they do is bad. I have noticed that when certain periodicals behave in an irresponsible way, I seldom find any criticism of their conduct in the other periodicals. I

know it is a bad thing for newspapers to call one another names; nor do I wish to encourage controversy between newspapermen. What I mean is that a responsible body has the right to pull up any member of that profession, if he is flagrantly wrong. Of course, every person has the right to express his views and I am not denying that; I am censuring only the utter irresponsibility and the vulgarity that newspapers of no great repute may descend to. I think such a body should firmly—politely if you like but firmly—make it clear that they do not approve of this kind of thing. Thus they will be giving a lead to the public in this respect.

I mentioned vulgarity. It is an odd world we live in, a rapidly changing world. We all hope that, in spite of difficulties and disasters, something good will ultimately emerge; but the one very grave and disheartening feature of the present day is a rapid fall in mental and moral standards all over the world. We disintegrate; we gradually go to pieces. Ultimately, we become, because of the process of disintegration, somewhat neurotic and hysterical and quite unable to judge anything. After all, unless we have certain values in life, life becomes rather empty; unless we have certain values in our public and in our mental conduct, it becomes difficult to see whither we are going and what we are trying to do. Great countries cannot live from hand to mouth, so far as standards and basic objectives are concerned. Those of you who have had personal experience of the last 30 years or so of India's history will have noticed periods in this history in which, one might say, a high moral tone prevailed among the people. The people are still the same. They are not different. They have the same failings and the same virtues. It is not easy to change an entire nation suddenly. But you can make them think of their virtues and strength or of their weaknesses and failings. Well, during these past thirty years, we did, I think, in our public life attain, often enough, high standards—unusually high standards. That was due to a great man who led us and who set those standards himself but the fact remains that we did attain them and because of that it is all the more noticeable and distressing to find such low standards at present. We

have to fight against these. Vulgarinity, however, is a world phenomenon and by no means peculiarly Indian. But, anyhow, we have to deal with it. Life, after all, may be considered from many points of view—political, economic and other; these are very important but surely there is something beyond all these; otherwise, everything that you gain by political thought and economic welfare, would be without significance. It is most distressing to see the gradual passing of what was gracious in life and instead a gradual extension and increase of what is vulgar. An individual may be good or bad, vulgar or otherwise. But it is a dangerous thing for a country to go down the scale of values in this way. In this matter, the press can perform a most important function. It can render much help in combating vulgarity. The views of a newspaper on political issues may not be accepted. I rather doubt myself if newspapers have any very great influence on political opinion. They give the news, of course; but I rather doubt if they have any great influence politically. You have seen in other countries—democratic countries—how a great number of newspapers have supported one party while another has won the elections. So, it appears that newspapers do not have the same effect on public opinion as people imagine they do. I am sure they wield tremendous power, not only through day to day news but through the colour they give it, through the restraint or looseness of expression, through vulgarity or its absence. The daily dose, regularly given, affects the reader's mind. If you tell him to do this or that, he may resist; but the slight daily dose, if it is right, improves his mind and, if it is wrong, corrupts it. There is a certain lack of social conscience in this country in spite of our high ideals. I react strongly against the idea of regimentation anywhere and much more so in a vast country like India, where there are so many different approaches, so many different aspects, to life. But I am also against the loose and incorrect behaviour of the people and their lack of discipline. This weakens us physically but, what is worse, it weakens us psychologically, too. In this matter also, I think, the press can help tremendously, not only by building up a better and a higher social conscience but also a code of

social behaviour in the little things of life. We tend to think that we need not worry about the little things of life because we are preoccupied with the big things of life. That is utterly and fundamentally wrong. If you are, let us say, wedded or attracted to the ideal of truth and beauty, you cannot follow that ideal if you deal with the ugly and untruthful in the small things of life. We take pride in saying that the civilization of the West is a material one and is opposed to ours which is spiritual. Having said so, we indulge in things which totally lack the normal social proprieties. We say we are above them but, as a matter of fact, it is not quite clear where the question of spirituality comes in. I do not believe that a person who ignores the small things of life, the small truths, the small decencies, the small pleasantnesses, the small graciousness, can undertake anything big in a big way.

It is not a question of show or, should I say, ostentation. Of course, ostentation itself is the height of vulgarity; but the deliberate rejection of all refinement can also be a deliberate and rather aggressive way of saying 'oh, we don't care for the fineries of life and, therefore, we go about in unwashed condition and with our clothes and our appearance unkempt.'

I referred just now, in the past few words I said in Hindi, to the news that was splashed in big headlines in the morning papers today. It was about the possibility of my going to Washington and said that I had been summoned there for discussions. Now, as far as I know, there is absolutely no foundation for all this; it is only excitement on the part of some people and a search for a way out or a remedy for the world's ills that leads them to these flights of imagination. This particular thing may not do much harm, although it does a little always. Even so, I beg of you, more especially in these days, to be careful. I will see that steps are taken about the development of a liaison machinery between the press and the Government, more especially the External Affairs Ministry of the Government. It is very desirable and, so far as we are concerned, we should like to help in every way. It is a difficult matter, of course, always to know where to draw the line in regard to matters which are consider-

ed secret and which, if they leak out, would embarrass us greatly in our relations with other countries. Now, it all depends ultimately, if I may say so quite frankly, on the measure of co-operation received from the press in keeping secrecy. You can, of course, count on every co-operation from us.

We are meeting here today in the very extraordinary circumstances of the world and there are very grave crises facing us. I confess that the only way I can see myself approaching these big questions is in a spirit of deep earnestness and a great deal of humility. There are big questions affecting the future of the world, affecting the future happiness or misery or destruction of millions of people and no man can consider them without deep misgivings about his own capacity to show the right path and I am quite frank with you about this matter. I rather doubt if any country, even the biggest of them all, can have an adequate sense of direction. The matter is too complicated, too big and all we can do is, first of all, to have an earnest desire for something. What is that something? We will surely find, in the immediate context of today, that something is peace. There are many other things besides. But today peace is most important. If that is so, then how are we to attain peace or, at any rate, help in realizing it and avoiding that terrible catastrophe—war? Surely apart from any particular proposal that a country may put forward, a great deal depends on the basic approach. If you want peace among different countries, it is hardly a sensible or a logical thing to go about slanging one another, irritating one another, pointing out the faults and errors and sins of one another. Your argument may be perfectly valid and you may be justified in putting it forward. But my point is that the argument does not lead to the atmosphere of peace. It leads to the closing up of the people's minds and when minds are closed they become impervious to reason. Therefore, it seems to me, what is important today is that we should stop this business of running down one another and keep our feelings within ourselves and then try to find some way of stopping the rot.

The next step would be to consider these problems in this slightly new atmosphere and try to find a solution, even if it is a temporary one. The next step would, in that case, be towards a more durable solution. No country must endanger the world's peace merely on grounds of prestige or anger. That is all I can say. I feel and am quite sure that vast numbers of people, in every country all over the world, desire peace. Personally, I am prepared to go a step further and say that there is no government in the world which really desires war. There are, of course, governments which may be impelled by circumstances to believe that war is inevitable. That is a different thing and somehow we get entangled in a net and thus, without any desire, we are forced to go to war. Whether that is an example of determinism in human affairs I do not know; but I do think that every individual in his individual capacity as also larger groups, including nations, should fight against anything they consider evil and not submit to the fatal idea of determinism and thus allow themselves to be overwhelmed by disaster. So, I hope that the present-day India will throw all her weight in favour of a dispassionate consideration of the problems of peace.

We here and elsewhere are apt to say that this country is good or bad, as though countries were solid blocks which are good or bad. They consist of millions of human beings—very decent human beings, very peaceful human beings. Governments may go wrong and more so politicians. But do not ever talk of countries and peoples as bad. It is misleading to talk like that. There is a great deal of common humanity in all of us, in all the countries, although we may differ outwardly a great deal. Let us encourage that common humanity and that friendliness and let us not lose our heads, whatever happens.

THE MODERN NEWSPAPER

IT WAS very good of you to invite me again to this session of the All-India Newspaper Editors' Conference. In a sense, I feel at home here amongst you because apart from the fact that many of you are friends, I have often enough been on the fringe of the newspaper world and so have sometimes felt that I was entitled, to some extent, to call myself a newspaperman. Nevertheless, I feel some hesitation—perhaps that is not the right word—and do not quite know what you expect me to say or what I should say. There is a tendency, which I wish to resist, of just saying something in the nature of a platitude, of being impertinent enough to offer good advice which is seldom welcome to anybody. So, what am I to say?

I feel sometimes that I am growing old. It is an uncomfortable feeling and one of the signs of old age is that one does not approve of or like some of the new things. We become rather conservative and any development seems to signify some kind of degradation to those who are getting on in years. Now, I should like to give you one example. I just cannot make out why people see anything amusing in what are called comic strips. I cannot stand them for an instant and, mind you, it is not for lack of time. I read them and I am supposed to laugh; instead, I feel very gloomy after I have read them. They represent a new development from overseas which our newspapers are taking to. And I suppose they pay good money for it; but, as far as I am concerned, I would even pay money to escape from them if I could.

Now, that is an odd instance but this flashy type of journalism rather oppresses me. It does not matter but it might matter very much if I, in my conservatism, if you like to call it that, or old age, drew people's attention to wrong things or educated men in the wrong way. It is a platitude to talk about the great opportunities and power the newspapers and the press have in the modern world.


That power—wherever there is any power—can be exercised both in the right and the wrong way.

Scientific developments can be utilized, either for the advancement of humanity or for its destruction. Similarly, education may be of the right type or the wrong type; it may tone up the society or tone down the society. You talk and we talk and all of us talk about the freedom of the press. Every person, who has been conditioned by the democratic process to some extent, believes in the various freedoms. He would rather allow a little wrong to happen than suppress it, because if you attempt to suppress a wrong type of thing, a right type of thing may also be suppressed along with it and it is bad to suppress a right thing. Therefore, one tolerates a wrong thing, to some extent, so that the right may flourish, so that the right may ultimately overcome the wrong. For my part, I do think that basically it is dangerous to suppress thought and the expression of thought in any way, because this may, besides suppressing a particular good thing, produce many kinds of evil which stunt the growth of a social group. Believing this, I come up constantly against instances where this freedom of expression is utilized not merely to express the wrong thing but to produce an atmosphere and a mental climate which, I think, is not good and which lowers cultural as well as other standards. When this kind of thing is done on a large scale and done from day to day I am worried, though not for political reasons; I think in terms of the wider implications of the word 'culture' and of the increase and propagation of vulgarity which surely cannot be a good thing. I do not even say that we should suppress vulgarity; perhaps, a little vulgarity is good occasionally. Nevertheless, if the mental climate encourages vulgarity, I doubt if any one can consider it good. What is one to do in circumstances where one comes across what I call a rather vulgar and indecent approach from the point of view of culture? What is one to do about it? One can meet it with the right approach in the hope that right will win in the end. When you are up against a mental climate which encourages the things an immature mind likes, then you cannot get a chance to mature or grow up.

We talk a good deal about education; it is obviously a basic thing and a most important thing. Yet, I am sometimes a little frightened by the type of education that is given and the results that it produces. This does not mean that education is bad. But sometimes, the wrong type of education, instead of educating, merely produces, in an immature and illiterate mind, the impression that it is literate and knows everything. Any one in a position of responsibility has at least to ponder over these questions if not to decide them. When we talk of democracy, it is not enough to have some kind of political structure which may be called democratic. Obviously, it must have a background and basis in the masses of the people, in their education, in the kind of news that is supplied, in the other processes that we encourage or discourage.

You talk about the freedom of the press. Should a person bring out a sheet with the liberty simply to say and do every kind of wrong thing, under the aegis of the noble doctrine of the freedom of the press? Obviously, anybody can bring out anything; the only limitation can be that of money or the number of purchasers he will get. And he can do a lot of mischief by propagating all kinds of pernicious ideas—I am not thinking in terms of politics. Suppose some noted gangster started preaching gangsterism, not patently and obviously but in a disguised way. Well, then the freedom of the press would mean the preaching of gangsterism or the preaching of hatred of others, which is common enough in many countries. It may be that, if you have hatred in your mind, perhaps it is better to have it out instead of nursing it; but to preach it from day to day to immature minds, surely, cannot be good.


What exactly is the press? Whatever it may be, the money involved, the owner and the proprietor of that money are major factors. Does the freedom of the press ultimately mean freedom of the rich man to do what he likes with his money through the press? A poor man or a man with inadequate means, whether he is good or bad, won't have much of an opportunity to express himself except in a very limited and small way. He may be good; he may be brilliant but the persons who gets the opportunity nowadays is the person with



At the B.B.C. Television Press Conference during his visit to London to attend the Coronation, June 1953



With General Neguib at Cairo, June 1953



At the Independence Day celebrations, 1953



With the Prime Minister of Pakistan and Begum Mohammed Ali at Delhi, August 1953

At the inauguration of the Andhra State in Kurnool, October 1, 1953



means; he can run newspapers, buy them or stop them, employ people whom he likes and dismiss people whom he dislikes. So, it may be that the freedom of the press means not so much freedom of the writer to write what he will but rather of the owner of a newspaper to see that the writer writes something that he wants him to write. A great newspaper, while it is a very powerful organ, is, at the same time, a very very expensive undertaking financially. Normally speaking—and I speak with all deference—high standards and high intelligence are not allied with large quantities of money. A person with a large amount of money need not necessarily have high cultural standards or high literary standards or any high standards at all, though he may have the knack of making money. Therefore, the freedom of the press may come to mean the freedom of persons who have a knack of making money and that, after all, is not such a noble thing. I think of all these difficulties and wonder how we can have real freedom of the press—a real expression of opinion for or against whatever it might be, and no suppression of any real opinion provided it is not indecent or vulgar and provided it is not exploited for wrong ends.

Some of you, gentlemen, have protested that certain laws that our Parliament passed about a year ago were an infringement of the freedom of the press. I am neither defending those laws nor objecting to them; I only want to point out that there are difficulties in the way of any person who tries to think objectively and tries to consider a question, not in a vacuum—nothing, indeed, can be considered in a vacuum—but in relation to life as we have it, in relation to life in India if you like. Conditions differ and exactly the same principles may apply but the application of the principle may differ from country to country. For instance, when there is a war, there is suddenly all manner of suppression that people put up with. The freedom of the press goes; the Government in authority does what it likes under the cloak of security or whatever it may be and nobody complains, because, for the moment, the winning of the war becomes the primary objective. Under other conditions, the same principle is applied differently in different countries and, in the same country,

applied differently at different times. I don't think that exactly the same type and extent of freedom can be applied in all circumstances at all times or in all countries; we have always to adjust ourselves to a certain set of circumstances. Any responsible person must think of the totality of those circumstances and not of an individual thing here and there. The person in authority may, in all earnestness and in all honesty of purpose, begin to think—and often does think—that what he thinks is right whereas others are wrong. He may begin to think that he is indispensable and that, therefore, he must protect that particular idea or that particular group, party or individual, because he honestly thinks that his is the best opinion. It is a dangerous idea and more so when it is held by honest people. When dishonest people hold it, it does not matter so much, because you can always discount the view but an honest man who holds an opinion like that is a very difficult person to deal with. One has to guard against that and it is right that persons in authority should be subjected to criticism, to ceaseless criticism, I hope, to friendly criticism but criticism as strong as you like.

To some extent, politicians and newspapermen or journalists have much in common. Both presume to talk too much, to write too much, to deliver homilies; both, generally speaking, require no qualifications at all for their job. I do not mean to say that no politician or newspaperman has any qualifications. My point is that for any average profession—medicine, engineering or any other—a person has got to go through a long course of training. He must obtain his degrees and diplomas; only then he is allowed to practise. Not so the politician and the newspaperman. If he has a certain gift of expression, he gets going; whether or not there is any content behind that expression is totally immaterial. In fact, sometimes he gets on simply because he has the gift or the knack of abusing, just as some people have the knack of making money. It is amazing; I have never understood it. Some people also have the knack of getting hold of unsavoury things in life and making a fuss about them, thereby not only getting on in their profession but making money too. Now, unsavoury things should not

be covered up but one must keep some kind of balance. One cannot constantly talk about the drainage system and the like. It gives one an unbalanced view of life and of traditions. Some people take delight not only in unsavoury things, but in things which excite and incite, thus getting more people to buy their newspapers.

The other day, an editor in Delhi came to me after I had said something like this at a press conference. He came to me and said: 'What you said is perfectly correct, perfectly right. True, but what am I to do? My boss, my proprietor, insists on my writing in this way. I do not want to write that sort of thing but I do not want to be thrown out of my job. Therefore, I have to write the things to which you object. I also object to them.' It certainly is not a very noble confession to make but still it is rather an extraordinary thing when the editor of a paper with a fairly wide circulation should be compelled or should say that he is compelled to write the sort of thing which is creating communal trouble in Delhi by exaggerating a minor personal incident. That incident had nothing to do with the public; it could easily have been dealt with in a variety of ways, either privately or in public, legally or otherwise. It was, however, not dealt with that way. On the other hand, people's passions were being roused because of it. That editor frankly admitted that the paper sold more if he wrote like that. 'My proprietor wants me to increase the sale of the paper.' Now, how are we to deal with that kind of a situation?

The obvious thing is that there should be self-discipline, not only at the group level or at the journalists' or newspapermen's level but in your organization and in other organizations. Where there is no self-discipline, another kind of discipline has to be imposed sooner or later. No society will tolerate utter lack of discipline for long because it leads to chaotic conditions, whether they occur in a large way or in a small way. Since chaotic conditions cannot be tolerated, there must be discipline. This discipline may be self-discipline or imposed discipline or, to some extent, both. You may define democracy in a hundred ways but surely one of its definitions is self-discipline of the community. The less the

imposed discipline and the more the self-discipline, the higher is the development of democracy. Now, apply that to newspapers. When the newspaper world is in an undeveloped state in a country, there has to be more of imposed discipline but it does not fit in with the democratic way of life and should not be unduly encouraged. Clearly, there cannot be a vacuum. Unless self-discipline develops or standards grow, some kind of standards has to be imposed.

The other day there was a very gross case of libel. It was as bad as it could be. It concerned a member of our Foreign Service and, what is worse, his wife was referred to in one of the newspapers in the most indecent terms. The whole thing was hundred per cent false. The matter went to a law court in the ordinary way but the jury of journalists said it was not serious enough to punish the writer, although it was a most serious case in all conscience. Now, it did not redound to the credit of the jury that they should deal with a member of their own profession in that way, when the court had found him guilty and the whole thing a fantastic fabrication, doing injustice to a member of our Foreign Service and, worse still, to his wife. I do not want a person to be pilloried and sent to prison unless he commits an offence against criminal law. Unless you have the strongest possible public opinion amongst yourselves, unless you add some sanction to that, the code of ethics you are laying down will not go very far. Then matters will really be worse than they were previously, because you will have tried your best and failed. I should like you to consider these matters from this point of view.

Now, there is another aspect that I would like to put before you. All of you, newspaper editors and others, in fact, all of us, are city folk. No doubt towns and cities play a very important part everywhere; they also do in India but far less attention is paid here to the vast problems of our countryside. The day before yesterday, I was in the Bhil area, the Adivasi area, and thousands of Bhils came to see me. They interested me. I feel a little more at home among them than I do in the city of Delhi which, in spite of its many good points, occasionally makes me uncomfortable. India

contains a tremendous variety of people; indeed, besides the Bhils and other Adivasis, there are also millions of our peasant folk in other areas. I find that the newspapers deal only with very limited topics in a very limited way. Their horizon is narrow. Somebody said that the adventures of innocence are not worth recording. That is true; and so the wrong things have to be blazoned out, giving people the impression that there is much more of the wrong things than there really is. That, unfortunately, is one of the bad things that the newspapers have brought us. They blazon out to the world the wrong things that happen, simply because these things are exciting and, therefore, interesting. I suppose there is no remedy for that except to try and lay stress on the constructive aspect of other problems. Take international politics, for instance. The newspapers are full of conflicts, declarations or denunciations against persons or countries. Occasionally, denunciation may be good; I do not wish to rule it out. But when life is a string of denunciations, it becomes a little unbalanced and overdone. Indeed, it is as difficult to get at the truth as it is to hear anything if everybody is shrieking at the top of his voice. Nowadays, there is far too much of shrieking and one cannot understand what is being said. Newspapers naturally give more publicity to denunciations and the like than to the normal activities of vast numbers of human beings. Thus, we get an unbalanced view of the world. I do not know how we can balance it. I am posing to you some difficulties and problems that trouble me from time to time, because, as I told you, I get the impression at times that I am getting old and the sign of old age is that I begin to philosophize and ponder over problems which should not be my concern at all. I suppose, all of you, whether old or young, sometimes have these quiet, lucid moments. Normally a politician or a newspaperman has few lucid moments, because he functions from day to day, hour to hour and minute to minute. He does not have the time to think. That is the fault of our present-day civilization. Not only newspapermen and politicians but others, too, are gradually being drawn into the whirlpool of incessant activity without thinking. What this will lead to, I do not quite know. I

suppose, it is an inevitable development of technological improvements and advancement. This rushes along at a headlong pace, far faster than the average human mind can, with the result that we get entangled in the strings of thought. It is said of Erasmus that his entire library consisted of fifty books and he was supposed to have been one of the wisest men of his age. Nowadays, I do not know how many books we read, how many newspapers, periodicals and magazines and other things we wade through and forget soon after reading them. If we read books, we read them hurriedly because we have got into the habit of reading newspapers hurriedly. Obviously, nobody can sit down and read newspapers as one reads a book. Therefore, we apply the newspaper habit of reading to books with the result that our minds sometimes function with brilliance but hardly ever with depth. We may be clever. We may say an amusing or a witty thing and be pleased with ourselves but there is little depth of thought behind it. I do not know why I am telling you all this. It appears to me to be an inevitable development of the pace at which the world lives today. To put it differently the machine grows. I am not against the machine at all; I admire the machine very greatly. The machine grows and grows and grows till it becomes almost human; it begins to think—to give answers to questions. The machine becomes human and the human being appears to become more and more a machine, which is sad, because after all the machine has emerged from the human mind. Whether it is because of political, authoritarian or economic conditions or because of hunger, degradation or technological improvements—whatever the reason may be—if the human mind loses its creative faculty and becomes more and more of a machine, then surely that is a tragedy for humanity in spite of the tremendous growth of civilization in other ways, because that way the springs of culture will gradually dry up. It may revive itself; civilization may have some kind of reincarnation. Anything like that may happen. But the present stage of tremendous transition, with our hurried pace of living and hurried decisions, with no leisure, no opportunity or time for thinking, cannot by itself be a satisfactory

phase. It may be because of this that we do not think quite so much and are faced with difficulties all the time. If we cannot even think for ourselves, how are we to know what others are thinking? Surely, in order to understand a problem, it is necessary to try to know what others are thinking. Difficult as it is, it becomes even more so when we hardly know how our own mind is working. So, our thinking becomes a series of reactions and urges to stimuli. That is not thinking. Of course, in a large measure our thoughts are determined by circumstances. We do not have much control over them. Even so, I suppose there must be some freedom, otherwise our thoughts would merely be mechanical reactions to immediate events and to things said or done or written. That would be unfortunate enough in the individual or the group; but when the fate of a country or of the world depends upon these rapid reactions, then one becomes apprehensive about the future.

I have an infinite faith in humanity and in its capacity to survive every disaster. Anyhow, that is a question of faith and it is a good thing to have faith. Leaving faith aside for a moment, it is a little dangerous for the world's destiny to be governed merely by sudden and immediate reactions to events.

Coming back to newspapers, how far do they represent such reactions? They function in a difficult atmosphere; they have to say something quickly and they have not much time to think. If a newspaper is hostile to a person and has to give a reaction to what he says, it will give a reaction to him, not to what he says; that is what normally happens. If you dislike a country you give your reaction against that country, not against what has been said by that country, by that individual or by that group. If the newspapers do that, then, of course, they are not functioning satisfactorily. They are not functioning maturely or wisely. Of course, it is hardly appropriate to use the word wise in connection with newspapers but there is no reason why newspapers should not have some amount of leisured thinking and wisdom—if not always—in the leading articles. These are some odd thoughts that I have placed before you for your consideration as they came to my mind.

CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTION

COMPENSATION FOR COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY

THIS House has discussed many articles of the Constitution at considerable length. I doubt if there are many other articles which have given rise to so much discussion and debate as the present one I have moved. In this, many eminent lawyers have taken part, in private and other discussions; and, naturally, they have thrown a great deal of light on it—so much light, indeed, that its conflicting beams have often produced a certain measure of darkness. But the questions before us are really simple. It is true that there are two approaches to some questions, one being the individual right to property and the other the community's interest in or the community's right to that property. There is no necessary conflict between the two: sometimes, of course, they may overlap. The amendment I have moved is intended to remove or avoid that conflict and also to take into consideration fully both these rights—the right of the individual and the right of the community.

First of all, let us be quite clear that there is no question of expropriation without compensation, so far as this Constitution is concerned. If property is required for public use, it is a well-established law that it should be acquired by the State by compulsion, if necessary with compensation paid; and the law has laid down methods of determining that compensation. Now, normally speaking, in regard to such acquisition—it might be called petty acquisition or acquisition of small properties or even relatively large ones, if you like, for the improvement of a town or other similar purposes—the law has been clearly laid down. But today the community has to deal more and more with large schemes of social

reform, social engineering, etc., which can hardly be considered from the point of view of individual acquisition of a small piece of land or a small structure. Apart from every other difficulty, the question of time presents the main difficulty. Here is a piece of legislation that the community through its chosen representatives, considers essential for the progress and the safety of the State; it affects millions of people. Obviously, you cannot leave this piece of legislation to be the subject of long, wide-spread and continuous litigation in the courts of law. The future of millions of people may be affected; the whole structure of the State may be shaken to its foundations. So, we must keep these things in view. If the State wants to take the property, we have to see that fair and equitable compensation is given. But when we consider the equity of it, we have always to remember that equity does not apply only to the individual but also to the community. No individual can ultimately override the rights of the community at large. No community should injure and invade the rights of the individual, unless it be for the most urgent and important of reasons. How is all this going to be balanced? You may balance it, to some extent, by legal means but ultimately the balancing authority can only be the Sovereign Legislature of the country, which can keep before it the various factors—the public, political and other factors—that come into the picture. This Article, if you will only read it, leads you, by a chain of thought, to these various factors and, I think, deals with them in an equitable manner. It is true that some hon. Members may criticize this Article, perhaps because there is overlapping or lack of clarity in word or phrase here and there. That, to some extent, is inevitable when you try to bring together a large number of ideas, approaches and factors in one or more phrases.

The draft Article, which I have the honour to propose, is the result of a great deal of consultation and, in fact, of an attempt to bring about a compromise on the various approaches to this question. I feel that this attempt has, in a very large measure, succeeded. Perhaps, it does not meet the wishes of every individual who may like to emphasise one or the other part of it. But, I think, it is a just compromise

and it does justice and equity not only to the individual but also to the community.

The first clause in this Article lays down the basic principle that no person shall be deprived of his property save by the authority of law. The next clause says that the law should provide for compensation for the property acquired and should either fix the amount of the compensation or specify the principles according to which or the manner in which the compensation is to be determined. Clearly, it is a matter for the law or for Parliament. There is no reference to any judiciary. Much thought has been given to it and there has been much debate as to where the judiciary should come in. Eminent lawyers have told us that according to the proper interpretation of this clause, normally the judiciary should not and does not come in at all. Parliament fixes either the compensation itself or the principles governing the compensation and they should not be challenged except for one reason, namely, where it is thought that there has been a gross abuse of the law, where, in fact, there has been a fraud on the Constitution. Naturally, the judiciary comes in to see if there has been a fraud on the Constitution or not. But one, of course, presumes that any Parliament representing the entire community of the nation will certainly not commit a fraud on its own Constitution and will be deeply concerned that justice should be done to the individual and the community.

In regard to the other clauses, I need say very little except that clause (4) relates to Bills now pending before the Legislature of one of the States. The House is aware that there are such Bills pending. In order to avoid any doubt with regard to those measures it says that, as soon as the President has given his assent to that law, no question should be raised in a court of law in regard to the provisions of that enactment. This is, if you like, a kind of check so that nothing is done in a hurry by a Legislature. In such a case, the President will, no doubt, suggest such changes as he may consider fit and proper for consideration by Parliament.

Finally, there are certain other saving clauses about which I need not say much. Clause (6) again refers to any law

which has been passed within the last two years or so before the Constitution came into force. It says that, if the President certifies it, no other obstruction should be raised. Reading this Article, it seems surprising to me that we should have had a debate on it. This debate was, perhaps, due not so much to this Article as to other differences of opinion on the part of some Members of this House and, I believe, of many outside.

We are passing through a tremendous age of transition. That, of course, is a platitude. Nevertheless, platitudes have sometimes to be repeated and remembered, lest in forgetting them we should land ourselves in difficulties. When a transition takes place, the social system, including the system of law, has to undergo changes. Conceptions, which had seemed basic to us, must thus undergo changes. And I draw the attention of the House to the very conception of property, which may appear to us to be unchanging but which has, in fact, been changing throughout the ages. It has changed very greatly and, even today, is undergoing a very rapid change. There was a period when even human beings were regarded as property. The king owned everything—the land, the cattle, the human beings. Property used to be measured in terms of cows and bullocks in the old days. Subsequently, property in land became more important. Gradually, the property in human beings ceased to exist. If you go back to the period of the great debates on slavery, you will find how the same arguments were advanced with regard to human beings as are sometimes advanced now with regard to the other forms of property. Well, slavery ceased to exist. Gradually, the idea of property underwent changes, not so much through legislation as through the development of human society. Today, as it was yesterday, land is likely to be a very important kind of property. One cannot overlook this fact. Nevertheless, today there are other kinds of property which are very important in industrially developed countries. Ultimately, we have reached a stage when property consists chiefly of a bundle of papers in the millionaire's hands and these papers represent millions in securities, promissory notes and so on. That is the conception

of property today; that is the current conception of the millionaire. In other words, property has become more and more a question of credit. It becomes more and more immaterial, more and more of a shadow. A man with credit is thus the real owner of property and can raise loans and can do wonders, with that credit. But a man with no credit can do nothing at all. I am merely mentioning this to the House to show how the idea of property has been a changing one, where society has been changing rapidly owing to various revolutions, industrial and other.

There is another change that has taken place. Property remains, of course, property but its ownership is gradually beginning to be more and more general. The individual, instead of being the exclusive owner of a small property, is having more and more share in large properties in common with others who are his co-sharers. Co-operative undertakings and, to some extent, the joint-stock system thus came into being. So also, in a sense, spread the idea of an individual becoming a part owner or a member of a group of owners of large properties which no single individual could hold, except very rarely. In recent years, the tendency has been for the monopoly of wealth and property to pass into a limited number of hands. This does not apply to India so much, because we have not developed much in that direction; but where countries have grown fast industrially, there has arisen monopoly of capital, with the result that the old idea of property and free enterprise is not easily applicable to present-day conditions, because, in the ultimate analysis, the few persons who have the monopoly of capital really dominate the scene. By their method of business and by virtue of the fact that they have large sums of money at their command, they can, for instance, squeeze out the little shopkeeper. Without giving the slightest compensation, they can crush him out of existence altogether. The small man is crushed out of existence by the modern tendency to have money-power concentrated in a few hands. Thus the old conception of property in individual ownership suffers not only from social developments as we see them taking place and from new conceptions of co-operative

ownership of property but also from developments on old lines which enable a rich man with capital to buy out the man of small means.

How are you going to protect the individual? I began by saying that there are two approaches—the individual approach and the approach in terms of the community. Few individuals, strong enough to protect themselves, are, indeed, left and they are becoming fewer and fewer. In such a state of affairs, the State has to protect the individual's right to property. The individual may possess property but it may mean nothing to him, because some kind of monopoly steps in and deprives him of the enjoyment of his property. The subject, therefore, is not a simple one. You say you are protecting the individual's rights; but he may lose that right completely through the various forces at work today, both in a capitalist and in a socialist direction.

Well, this is obviously a large question and one can consider its various aspects at length. I wish to place before the House just a hint of the broad issues, because I am a little afraid that the House may be moved by legal arguments of extreme subtlety and cleverness, ignoring the human aspect and other aspects of the problem.

The House has also to keep in mind the transitional and the revolutionary aspects of the problem, because when you think of the land question in India today, you are really thinking of something dynamic, moving and changing, something revolutionary. It may well change the face of India either way; whether you deal or do not deal with the problem, it is not something which is entirely within the control of law and Parliament. That is to say, if law and Parliament do not fit themselves into the changing picture, they will be unable wholly to control the situation.

We must not, therefore, consider these problems in the narrow, legalistic and juristic sense. There are some hon. Members here who are owners of land, owners of *zamindaries*. Naturally, they feel that their interests might be affected by the land legislation. But I think that the way the land legislation is being dealt with today—and I am acquainted with the land legislation in the United Provinces a little more

intimately than elsewhere—may appear to hon. Members to be not completely right so far they are concerned; but, even from the point of view of their interests, it is a better and a juster way than any other way that will come later. The latter way may not be one of legislation. The land question may be settled in a different manner altogether. If you look at the situation all the world over and especially in Asia, you will inevitably come to the conclusion that nothing is more important and vital than a gradual abolition of the big estates. The policy of the abolition of big estates is not a new policy but one that was laid down by the National Congress years ago. So far as we are concerned, we, who are connected with the Congress, shall, naturally, give effect to that pledge completely—one hundred per cent—and no legal subtlety, no change, is going to come in our way. That is quite clear. We will honour our pledges. Within limits, no judge and no supreme court will be allowed to constitute themselves into a third chamber. No supreme court and no judiciary will sit in judgment over the sovereign will of Parliament which represents the will of the entire community. If we go wrong here and there, they can point it out; but, in the ultimate analysis, where the future of the community is concerned, no judiciary must come in the way. Ultimately, the whole Constitution is a creature of Parliament. But we must respect the judiciary, the Supreme Court and the High Courts in the land.

As wise people, the duty of the judges is to see that in a moment of passion, in a moment of excitement, the representatives of the people do not go wrong; there is, of course, the possibility that they might. In the detached atmosphere of the courts, they should see to it that nothing is done that is against the Constitution, that may be against the good of the country, that may be against the community in the larger sense of the term. Therefore, if such a thing were to occur, they should draw our attention to that fact but it is obvious that no court, no system of judiciary should be allowed to function in the nature of a third house, as a kind of Third House of Correction. You have decided, the House has decided, rather most of the Provincial Governments have

decided, to have a Second Chamber. Why has it been so decided? The Second Chamber also is mostly an elected Chamber. Presumably, they have so decided, because we want some check somewhere on any hasty decision of the First Chamber, which that Chamber itself may later regret and may wish to go back on. So, from that point of view, it is desirable to have people whose duty is, not in any small matters but with regard to the basic principles that you lay down, to see that you do not go wrong, as sometimes the legislature may go wrong; but ultimately the fact remains that the legislature must be supreme and must not be interfered with by the courts of law in measures of social reform. If it is interfered with, you will have strange procedures adopted. Of course, one of them is to change the Constitution. The other is what we have seen in great countries across the seas where the executive, which is responsible for the appointment of the judiciary, begins to appoint judges of its own liking to get decisions in its own favour; but that is not a very desirable method. I submit, therefore, that the approach made in this Resolution protects both the individual and the community. It gives the final authority to Parliament, subject only to the scrutiny of the superior courts in case of grave error, in case of contravention of the Constitution or the like, not otherwise. And finally, in regard to certain pending measure or measures that have been passed, it makes it clear beyond any doubt that there should be no interference.

THE STATIC ELEMENT

THIS BILL is not a very complicated one; nor is it a big one. Nevertheless, I need hardly point out that it is of great intrinsic importance. Anything dealing with the Constitution or with changes in it is of importance. Anything dealing with

Speech in Parliament while moving that the Bill to amend the Constitution of India be referred to a Select Committee, New Delhi, May 16, 1951

fundamental rights incorporated in the Constitution is of even greater importance. Therefore, the Government introduces this Bill in no spirit of light-heartedness or in haste but after the most careful thought and scrutiny.

I might inform the House that we have been thinking about this matter for several months. We have been consulting people, the State Governments, the Ministers of the State Governments and, when the occasion offered itself, a number of Members of this House. We have referred this Bill to various committees and the like and taken such advice from competent legal quarters as we could obtain. We have brought it forward now in the best form that we could give it, because we thought that the amendments mentioned in this Bill are not only necessary but desirable and because we thought that if these changes are not made, not only would great difficulties arise as they have arisen in the past few months but, perhaps, some of the very purposes of the Constitution stood in danger of being defeated or delayed. In a sense, the matter has been mentioned rather vaguely and has been before the public for some time. But the precise form, in which it appears in this Bill, was given to it only a few days ago when I presented it to the House.

There has been a great variety of criticism. There has been criticism, not only in our own country as there should be but also in some foreign countries, where some of our friends or those who were our friends have got into the habit of criticizing whatever we do. If we do something to seek peace, our action is criticized. If we do something else, they say that we are not peaceful. And so, as I said, there has been a good deal of criticism and we welcome it, because in a matter of this kind, the greater the scrutiny, the better it is. May I say that it is with no desire to hurry this Bill that I have mentioned an early date for the report of the Select Committee? I do not myself see how a prolongation of the date for a relatively simple Bill, however important, enables us to give greater thought to it. With regard to the three or four articles, such thought and experience as we have can surely be brought to bear on the question within a few days; and even if we were to agree to extend the period from a few

days to a few weeks, such an extension is not going to increase the amount of concentrated attention or thought that we might give it.

One of the things that has been criticized is that this House, since it was elected on a narrow franchise, is not really representative of the country and of the organized will of the community. Therefore, it is not competent to deal with such amendments. I seem to remember that the very people who have so criticized us also questioned the right of the House which preceded this to represent the people. The same people again criticized the Constituent Assembly, which was elected on a narrow franchise, for daring to draft the Constitution of India. That Constituent Assembly now belongs to history and is no more; but we who sit here—or nearly all of us—still continue that tradition, that link. In fact, it is we, after all, who were the Constituent Assembly and who drafted this Constitution. Then, we were not supposed to be competent enough to draft the Constitution. But now the work we did has been found so perfect that we are no longer competent to touch it! That is rather a curious argument. We are here, because after the experience of nearly a year and a half we have naturally learned much. We have found, if I may say so, some errors of drafting and, possibly, of interpretation. That is but natural. And the House will also remember that when this matter of the Constitution was being considered in the Constituent Assembly, a clause or an article was proposed that, within the space of five years, any changes made in the Constitution should be relatively easy, that an easy procedure and not the normal procedure laid down should be followed. Why? Because it was thought—and, if I may say so, rightly thought—that after a little while many little things would come to our notice which had not come up in the course of the debate and which we could rectify with relative ease, so that after this preliminary experience we could, more or less, finalize the Constitution. We thought that in this way there would be no necessity for extensive amendments. Unfortunately, that particular clause was dropped. Nevertheless, the House can proceed, in the manner provided by the Constitution, to amend it if it so chooses.

There is no doubt that this House has that authority. At the moment, I am talking, not of the legal or constitutional authority but of moral authority, because, roughly speaking, it is this House that made the Constitution. We are the inheritors or the fathers of the Constitution. We really hammered it out and shaped it after years of close debate. Now, we come to this House for amendments because it has been pointed out to us by judicial interpretations that some lacunae exist. We have noticed also that difficulties arise because there are various interpretations. Let me say right at the outset that, so far as the Constitution is concerned, it is the right and privilege of the highest courts of the land to interpret it as they will; and it is not for us as individuals or even as a government to challenge that right. The judiciary must necessarily stand above, shall I say, political conflicts or political interpretations. They have to interpret the Constitution in the light of the law and with such light as they can throw on it. We respect their interpretations and we must carry out their decisions. But having accepted an interpretation, it is the business of Parliament to see that the purpose we aimed at is being fulfilled; if it is not fulfilled, then the will of the community is not being effective. And if, ultimately, the will of the community is not effective, then serious difficulties might arise at any time, more so at a time like this when powerful and dynamic forces are at work, not merely in India, not merely in Asia but all over the world, when nothing can be thought of as being static or unchanging. Therefore, while we fully respect what the courts of the land have laid down and obey their decisions, nevertheless, it should be our duty to see whether the Constitution so interpreted was rightly framed and whether it was desirable to change it here and there so as to give effect to what, in our opinion, was really intended or should have been intended. Therefore, I come before this House, not to challenge any judicial interpretation but to take the assistance of this House in clearing up doubts and in removing certain anomalies which have hampered our progress in the sphere of social reform and so on.

This House knows very well that there are many kinds of

constitutions in the world. There is, for instance, the kind of constitution that is not written down, such as the Constitution of the United Kingdom. There Parliament is absolutely supreme and can do and say what it likes and what it says is the law of the land, which no court can challenge, whatever the latter's interpretation of the law may be. Then, there is the written constitution, like the Constitution of that great country, the United States of America. In America, the Constitution, to some extent, limits the authority of the Legislature, so far as certain fundamental rights or other provisions are concerned. Now, in the United States of America, by a long course of judicial decisions, healthy conventions have arisen and the power of the Legislature has been widened somewhat. Because of the interpretations by high judicial authority and, perhaps because of these conventions, the extreme rigidity of the written word has, in the course of generations, become less so. I have no doubt that if we live through a static period, such conventions will gradually arise here, too, thus affording a certain flexibility to the written word. I am sure that our courts will also help in lessening that rigidity. But, unfortunately, we did not have much time. It is barely a year ago that we started functioning under this Constitution. To begin with, therefore, it is only the written word, in all its rigid aspects, that apparently counts and not the many inner meanings that we may seek to give it.

We are deprived of the benefit of the slow process of judicial interpretation and development of conventions which the other countries with written constitutions, such as the United States of America, have gone through. We live in these rapidly changing times and we cannot wait. We have to give a slightly different shape to the written word. In effect, we are doing what judicial interpretation might have done and probably would have done in the normal course and we have come up before the House for that purpose.

Now, a great deal has been said about the desire of this Government to put a curb or restraint on the freedom of the citizens or the press or of groups. First of all, may I remind the House that, perhaps, this Bill only makes it clear as to

what the authority of Parliament is? We are not putting down any kind of curb or restraint. We are removing certain doubts so as to enable Parliament to function if and when it so chooses. Except for the clarification as to the extent of the authority of Parliament, nothing will happen when this Bill is passed. May I also point out to this House that we in the Government and in the House have not a very long life? This session is coming to a close and after this there is likely to be a brief session again before the general elections take place in this country. The present Parliament will give place to another—a larger one, perhaps a different one. This Government may give place to another and, whatever changes we may make in the Constitution today, it is highly unlikely that this Government or this Parliament will take advantage of them by passing laws to that effect, unless some very severe crisis, national or international, arises meanwhile. In effect, therefore, this Government is not trying to seek power to consolidate itself. I do certainly repudiate the suggestion which has been made that any of these amendments are meant to be utilized for political or party purposes. Nothing could be farther from our thoughts and, indeed, from the practical point of view, the House will observe that this can hardly be done. We do wish that when we walk away from the present scene, we may leave something for the succeeding Parliament and for the younger generation that will follow, something that they can wield and handle with ease for the advancement of India and not something which will always come in their way and deflect them from the purpose they have in view. It is from this point of view that we have put forward this Bill.

Now, the House is seized of this Bill and, no doubt, the Members have noticed the various proposals made therein. A number of amendments might be called rather secondary in importance because they do not concern any vital matters of principle. I shall point them out to the House a little later. They are not of great importance; but they have come up before us because of certain difficulties which we have experienced. For instance, if I may mention one particular difficulty, one of the articles—for the moment I forget the

number—lays down that this House should meet twice a year and the President should address it. A possible interpretation of that Article can be that this House has not met at all this year. It is an extraordinary position considering that this time the House has laboured more than probably it has ever done at any time in the previous history of this or the preceding Legislature in this country. We have been sitting practically since October with an interval for Xmas and we are likely to carry on longer. And yet, it may be held by some acute interpreters that we have not met at all this year according to the strict terms of the Constitution, for we started meeting in October and we have not met again; nor has Parliament been prorogued or addressed by the President this year. Put it in the extreme way and suppose that this House met for the full year and worked for twelve months without a break except short ones. It may then be said under the strict letter of the law that it has not met at all this year. Of course, that Article was meant not to come in the way of our work but to come in the way of our leisure. It was, indeed, intended to mean that the House must meet at least twice a year and that there should not be more than six months' interval between the meetings. It did not intend any government of the day simply to sit tight without letting the House meet. On the contrary, the Article makes it incumbent upon the Government to see that the House meets at least twice a year and without too long an interval. Three or four amendments deal with this. That is to say, two of them deal with Parliament and two deal with the State Assemblies because the same rule affects them also. There are one or two other matters which are rather of a minor character. I might as well refer to them before I go on to the more important one.

Article 85 is the article to which I have referred in connection with the sessions of Parliament, its prorogation and dissolution. Article 87 is consequential to the change. So also are Articles 174 and 176 which apply to the State Assemblies in the same way in regard to Governors summoning them twice a year. Then, Articles 341 and 342 relate to the notification of Scheduled Tribes and Castes by the President.

Here, it is really a verbal change to make the position clear because some States have no Rajpramukhs.

Article 372 relates to the adaptation of laws where it is sought to increase the period from two to three years. Article 376—the last one—enables the Government to appoint a Chief Justice even though he might not be a citizen of India. These are relatively minor points. The really important provisions which I am putting before the House relate to Article 19 and Article 31. There is also Article 15 with which I will deal first. In Article 15, it is sought to add certain words. Perhaps, it might appear that these words are redundant. Nevertheless, it has been considered desirable to add them and I am quite sure that a slight addition is desirable from the point of view of clarity.

The real difficulty which has come up before us is this. The Constitution lays down certain Directive Principles of State Policy. We agreed to them after a long discussion and they point out the way we must travel. The Constitution also lays down certain Fundamental Rights. Both are important. The Directive Principles of State Policy represent a dynamic move towards a certain objective. The Fundamental Rights represent something static; their object is to preserve certain rights which already exist. Both again are right. But sometimes it might so happen that the dynamic movement and the static concept do not quite fit in with each other.

A dynamic movement towards a certain objective necessarily means certain changes: that is the essence of movement. Now, it may be that, in the process of movement, certain existing relationships are altered, varied or affected. In fact, it is meant to affect those settled relationships and yet if you come back to the Fundamental Rights they are meant to preserve, though not always directly, certain settled relationships. There is a certain conflict between the two approaches but I am sure it is not an inherent one. However, there is some difficulty and, naturally, when the courts of the land have to consider these matters, they have to lay stress more on the Fundamental Rights than on the Directive Principles of the State Policy. The result is that the whole purpose behind the Constitution, which was meant to be a

dynamic constitution, leading to a certain goal step by step, is hampered and hindered by the static element which has been emphasized a little more than the dynamic element; and we have to find a way out of the difficulty.

The amendment which I seek to move is, to be quite frank with the House, not a solution of the basic problem which will come up before the House in various shapes and forms from time to time. But it does lay stress on one small aspect of it.

May I also point out and try to remove a possible misconception that might be in the minds of some hon. Members? They might think that this is, perhaps, a devious method of bringing in the communal element in the consideration of this problem. I want to make it perfectly clear that, so far as the Government is concerned, it does not wish to have any truck with communalism in any form. All that it wants to do is to help the backward classes, which are specially mentioned in the Constitution, to grow. If we think of them in terms of a community, we bring in communalism. But if we deal with the backward classes as such, irrespective of what religion or group they belong to, then it is our duty to help them to advance, educationally, socially and economically. Naturally, that advance is not meant to be at the expense of others.

The House may remember Article 29(2) which says that no one by reason of his religion, etc., should be kept out of an educational institution. That is a fundamental thing by which this Constitution stands and we must stand by it. There is no question of evading that. What I submit is that while we respect that Article we have also to respect the fundamental directive of this Constitution and the fundamental aims of our policy, namely, that we must encourage and help those who are backward to rise and give them proper training and proper opportunities for social and economic advance.

The essential difficulty lies in the fact that the whole conception of fundamental rights is for the protection of individual liberty and freedom. That is a basic conception and to know where it was derived from you have to go back

to European history in the latter days of the 18th century, roughly speaking, from the days of the French Revolution on to the 19th century. That might be said to be the dominating idea of the 19th century and it has continued to be a matter of fundamental importance. Nevertheless, as the 19th century marched into the 20th and as the 20th century wore on, other additional ideas came into the field which are represented by our Directive Principles of State Policy. In the process of protecting individual liberty, if you also protect individual or group inequality, then you come into conflict with that directive principle. If, therefore, an appeal to individual liberty and freedom is construed as an appeal for the continuation of the existing inequality, then you come up against difficulties. You become static and unprogressive and cannot change; you cannot realize the ideal of an egalitarian society which, I hope, most of us want.

Now, to return to this particular amendment, if its wording can be varied and improved, I should welcome it. I do not stick to any particular wording. In the Select Committee or outside different words may be suggested, which would, perhaps, make the meaning I have sought to put before the House clearer and I would certainly welcome the change.

Then, we come to the two main Articles which have to be dealt with in this Bill. Article 19 deals with clause (2) of the Fundamental Rights. It has been said that this Government seeks to curb and restrict the freedom of the press. Hon. Members are fully aware of the state of affairs today. I don't think there is any country in the world at the present moment where there is so much freedom—if I may use the word for the moment—in regard to the press as in India. I have frequently given expression to my appreciation of the way responsible journals in this country are conducted. I should like to say so again. But I have also drawn attention to the way the less responsible news-sheets are conducted and it has become a matter of the deepest distress to me to see some of these news-sheets coming out from day to day, full of vulgarity, indecency and falsehood. This does not injure me or this House much but it poisons the minds of the younger

generation, degrading their mental integrity and moral standards. For me, it is not a political but a moral problem. How are we to save our younger generation from this progressive degradation and poisoning of the mind and spirit? From the way untruth is bandied about and falsehood spread, it has become quite impossible to distinguish what is true from what is false. Imagine our younger generation in the schools and colleges reading these news-sheets, imagine our soldiers and our sailors and our airmen reading them from day to day! What kind of impression do you think they will make on their minds?

Yes, we can be quite sure that we have the completest freedom of the press. But freedom like everything else, indeed, more than everything else, carries certain responsibilities and obligations and a certain discipline with it. If a sense of responsibility, obligation and discipline is lacking, then it is not freedom but the absence of freedom, whether it is in individual who indulges in it or a group or a newspaper.

For my part, as I grow in years, I become more and more convinced that one cannot deal with any major problem, whether it is international or national, by simply relying on coercive processes. I have come to realize this more and more. I know, of course, that, essentially, the duty or at any rate a part of the duty of a government is to coerce the evil-doer according to the laws of the land. Till we are able to rise to higher levels, a government will always have that duty. I know that it is the duty of governments to protect the freedom of the country from external invasion, by keeping armies and navies and the like. And so, in spite of my deep and almost instinctive belief that this violence does not solve any problem, I have to rely on coercive processes and on the Army and the Navy. I have to keep them in the most effective and efficient trim. Therefore, it is not with any idea of trying to improve the morals of the country by coercive processes that I approach this question. I do not believe that morality is improved by coercive processes, whether in the individual or in the group. Nevertheless, when there is a total lack of those restraints which make up a civilization and which lie behind any culture, whether it is

of the East or the West, when there is no sense of responsibility and obligation, we have to do something to combat the corroding influence and stop the disintegrating processes that undermine society.

Now, I am in a difficulty. This particular amendment is not, let me remind the House, a law curbing or restraining anybody. All these amendments are enabling measures intended merely to define the powers of Parliament which might be challenged and have been challenged with regard to some matters. Things remain, so far as the law is concerned, exactly as they were, as long as this Parliament or a future Parliament does not alter them after due thought. I have never heard of any one saying that in the United Kingdom there is no freedom of the press or freedom of anything because Parliament is all-powerful. I have never heard that said. It is only here that we seem not to rely on ourselves, not to have faith in ourselves, in our Parliament or our Assemblies but on some external authority, just as some of us relied on the British in the old days. After all, the responsibility for the governance of India, for the advancement of India, lies on this and future Parliaments and if this Parliament or future Parliaments of India do not come up to our expectations, then it will bode India no good. You rely on this Parliament for the biggest things and yet you come and tell us, *'Don't trust this Parliament because it may do something wrong, it may do something against the Constitution.'* I would beg the House to remember that this Bill does not bring in any offence, any curb, any restraint. I repeat that it is only an enabling measure defining the power of Parliament to deal with certain matters.

Now, as I have said, I have a difficulty in dealing with the press. The press is one of the vital organs of modern life, especially in a democracy. The press has tremendous powers and tremendous responsibilities. The press must be respected and it must also have co-operation. In a somewhat varied career, I have sometimes considered myself a bit of a journalist too. So, I approach this question not as an outsider but, to some extent, as one of the profession, with full sympathy for the difficulties that journalists and newspapermen

and editors have to face. But then, what is the press? Is it represented by the great organs of national opinion or by the two-page news-sheets that come out overnight from time to time, without any regularity, full of abuse and sometimes even used for the purpose of blackmail? What standard do I have to accept? Every paper claims itself to be the press. Nobody thinks of restraining the freedom of the responsible organs unless something very extraordinary happens. But what are we to do with these little sheets that come out from day to day and poison and vitiate the atmosphere? They are dangerous things. In their case, power and responsibility do not go together. But I suppose, one has to face the modern world with its good as well as its bad and it is better, on the whole, I think, that we give licence rather than suppress the normal flow of opinion. That, at any rate, is the democratic method. But having laid that down, I would beg to say that there is a limit to the licence that one can allow, more so in times of great peril to the State. At the present moment, it is our good fortune that in spite of the difficult problems that we have to face in the country, we still function normally; the machinery of government continues to work; the administration goes on and we try as best we can to face our problems. Yet, we live in times of grave danger to the world. No man can say what the next few months might not bring—the next few months or, if you like, the next year. I am not thinking only of the elections but of other things that are bigger than elections. Now, at this moment, when great countries—not to mention smaller ones—think almost in terms of struggling for survival, when they think that, in spite of their greatness and power, they are in danger, then all of us have to think in terms of survival. And, when a country is face to face with grave national problems and questions of life and death and survival, then there must be a certain priority and a certain preference in its method of doing things. Whether there is a war or not, we live in a state of deep crisis. So, in this critical stage where there is always the question of survival, we cannot function loosely, inefficiently, without discipline, without responsibility, without thinking of our obligations.

Therefore, it becomes necessary to give power to this Parliament or to a future Parliament, which will represent the organized will of the community in India, to take, in times of crisis, such steps as it deems fit. To prevent us from doing this is to deceive yourself and not to have faith in yourself and to become unable to meet a crisis when it arises, perhaps, thereby injuring the cause you represent.

Now, what are the amendments that are said to be curbs and restraints on the press? In the main, the amendment to clause (2) of Article 19 that we suggest contains three new phrases. The three phrases are: friendly relations with foreign States, public order and incitement to an offence. All the rest, apart from minor changes in the words, are practically in the old clause (2). The new clause reads thus:

“(2) Nothing in sub-clause (a) of clause (1) shall affect the operation of any existing law in so far as it imposes, or prevents the State from making any law imposing, in the interests of the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or morality, restrictions on the exercise of the right conferred by the said sub-clause, and, in particular, nothing in the said sub-clause shall affect the operation of any existing law in so far as it relates to, or prevents the State from making any law relating to contempt of court, defamation or incitement to an offence.”

The three novel words or sets of words, compared with the old phraseology, are: friendly relations with foreign States, public order and incitement to an offence. Let us examine them. For the moment, as I said, it is only an enabling measure giving power to Parliament. But let us go beyond that. Does it involve any radical attack on the basic conception of the fundamental rights? Take the first thing—foreign relations. Now, if any one thinks that this is meant to stifle criticism of foreign countries, he is wrong; it is certainly not my intention nor, I am quite sure, is it the intention of my Government. Ultimately, of course, should the occasion arise, it will be the subject of legislation that Parliament will undertake. We are not framing any legislation here. We can only indicate what the legislation is to be

about. This House will realize that, at this particular moment when the international situation is delicate and tense, we cannot take any risks. Anything said and done continuously may lead to the gravest consequences in regard to foreign countries and to a rapid deterioration of our relations with that foreign country. The question as to when that particular power is to be granted is surely one that needs careful examination. All that is said here is that the authority to deal with this matter should vest with Parliament and should not be taken away. I hope no Member in this House is prepared to say that this House should not have the authority to deal with this matter when grave international issues are involved. We would, indeed, be helpless spectators of a steadily deteriorating situation unless this House is armed with the authority to deal with it in good time.

Then the other things are "public order" and "incitement to an offence". If such words were to be used in an actual piece of legislation, they would require to be examined strictly, as to how far they go and what powers they would confer on the executive. But when you use them here, in the sense of enabling Parliament to take steps, then you should use some general phrase which would not limit the power of Parliament to face a situation. When, however, it brings any legislation to that effect, then examine it thoroughly and carefully. It is clear that the original clause, as interpreted by superior courts in this country, has put this Government and would put any government in a very difficult position. The House knows—and it is mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons—that one of the High Courts held that even murder or like offences can be preached. Now, it is an extraordinary state of affairs if this can be done. It may be and, I am quite sure, it will be that in the long run judicial interpretation will gradually bring things more in line with what I would beg to call the spirit of the Constitution. I have no doubt that, in course of time, with the help of the highest courts in the land, we shall develop conventions which will eventually widen the authority of the Legislature to deal with such matters as has happened in the United States of America. The unfortunate

part of it is that we just can't wait for a generation or two for these conventions to develop. We have to deal with the situation today and tomorrow, this year and the next year. Therefore, the safest course is not to pass a legislation in a hurry but to enable Parliament to have the authority to deal with such matters. I confess my own belief is that it is always better for Parliament to have a large measure of authority, even the authority to make mistakes. Certainly, I realize that in the conditions as they exist in India today, the exact form of the Constitution of the United Kingdom, for instance, is not applicable. We are too big a country, too varied a country. We have to have a kind of Federation of States that are, roughly speaking, autonomous. Therefore, it is inevitable that we should have a written constitution. We have framed it and it is a fine constitution. Gradually, as we work it, difficulties appear. As wise men, we deal with them and change the Constitution accordingly. May I say, in connection with the use of the coercive apparatus of the State to deal with these problems, that it has been our misfortune in the past two or three years to have had to use it in a variety of ways? We have had to use it because we have had sometimes to face a challenge which can only be comparable to the challenge of war. The challenge may have come from inside but it was none-the-less a challenge to the State as war is a challenge, a challenge through violence and violent effort. We had to face it—as every State has to face it—by the organized strength of the State, whether it is of the police or of the military, whether it was in Telengana or elsewhere. Speaking of Telengana, I should like to remind the House of what is happening today. The situation is being met in a different way. It is a peaceful way, a non-violent way. We have been seeing the frail figure of Vinoba Bhave marching alone into Telengana and producing a tremendous effect on the people by his word and action and producing, perhaps even now, much more effect than any armed force could have done. If it is so effective even in the immediate present, taking a longer view, it will certainly be much more so. It is patent that the effect of armed force is good for the time being but in the long run it may not be

so effective and may, in addition, leave a trail of bitter memories.

I shall now proceed with another important thing, namely, Article 31. When I think of this Article, a whole array of pictures comes before my mind, because this Article deals with the abolition of the *zamindari* system, with land laws and the agrarian reform. I am not a *zamindar*; nor am I a tenant. I am an outsider. But throughout my public life I have been intimately connected with agrarian agitation in my province. I have a certain emotional reaction to it and an awareness of it, which is not merely intellectual but much more. If there is one thing to which we, as a party, have been committed in the past generation, it is the agrarian reform and the abolition of the *zamindari* system.

A survey of Asia today will lead any intelligent person to see that the basic and the primary problem in Asia is the land problem. There are many ways of dealing with this problem. And every day of delay adds to the difficulties and dangers. In many countries, we have seen this problem being dealt with quickly and without any check, either by absolute expropriation or by following some middle way, namely, that of partial expropriation and partial compensation of a nominal kind. Anyhow, they have done so and have produced a new stability. I am not going into the justice or injustice of it but am looking at it purely from the point of view of stability. Of course, if you go into the justice or injustice of the question, you have to take a longer view. However, we adopted another method and I think we were right in doing so. We tried to deal with the land problem, not in a hurry but as adequately as we could, after full thought and consideration. I am not going further into those questions but it is patent that when you are out to produce a certain basic equality, when you are out to remedy inequalities, you don't remedy inequalities by producing further inequalities. We don't want any one to suffer. But, inevitably, in big social changes some people have to suffer. We have to think in terms of large schemes of social engineering and not of petty reforms. Now, if all our schemes of reform like this are stopped, perhaps rightly stopped, maybe due to a correct

interpretation of the law, though here, too, the lawyers differ and even the judges have differed—then it means that we have to wait a generation for things to settle down. But we cannot wait—that is the difficulty. Even in the last three years or so, some very important measures passed by the State Assemblies have been held up. No doubt, as I said, the interpretation of the courts must be accepted as right but in the meantime you, I and the country have to face social and economic upheavals. How are we to meet this challenge of the times? How are we to answer the question: For the last 10 or 20 years, you have said, 'We will do this.' Why have you not done it? It is not good for us to say, 'We are helpless before fate and we are unequal to the situation which we are having to face at present.' Therefore, we have to think in terms of big changes and that is why we thought of amending Article 31. Ultimately, we thought it best to propose Article 31 (b) and to add to it a Schedule consisting of a number of Acts passed by the State Legislatures, some of which have been or might be challenged. We thought it best to save them from such impediments, so that the process of change which has been initiated by the State can go forward unhampered. Many of us present here are lawyers and have had some training in law which is good training and many of us respect lawyers. Nevertheless, a lawyer represents precedents and tradition and not change or dynamic processes. Above all, the lawyer represents litigation. We found that somehow the magnificent Constitution we had framed had been kidnapped and purloined by the lawyers. An hon. Member has called it a lawyer's paradise.

I do not grudge any one entering paradise; but what I do object to is the shutting of the door and the barring and bolting of it, so that others are prevented from coming in. The other day, I was reading an article about India by a very eminent American and in that article, which contained many correct and some incorrect statements, the author finished up by saying that India had very difficult problems to face. But the most acute of them, he said, could be put in five words and these five words were: land, water, babies, cows

and capital. I think that there is a great deal of truth in this concise analysis of the Indian situation.

Important as they are, I am not, for the moment, going to say anything about babies or cows; nor do I wish to say anything about capital which is a most important question. Our capital resources are matters with which my colleague, the Finance Minister, and the Planning Commission are dealing but we come back to land and water. Water is connected with the land that we want to improve. Finally, we come back to the land which is the most important of all and, if we do not make proper arrangements for the land, all our other schemes, whether they have to do with the Grow More Food campaign or with anything else, may fail. Therefore, it is necessary that something in the nature of the amendment to Article 31 I have suggested should be accepted. Again, if I may say so, what is intended is to give power to this House or to a future Parliament to deal with a crisis, so that it may not feel helpless when a situation arises which calls for its intervention.

INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL FREEDOM

M^R SPEAKER, Sir, we have had a prolonged debate on the Motion that I placed before the House. I have listened with due respect to the speeches that have been made and have tried to profit by them. I confess, Sir, that at the end of this debate I have a lurking suspicion that some Members of this House have not, perhaps, quite understood the import of this Bill or have drawn certain inferences without warrant. Some of the statements made have absolutely no bearing on this Bill as far as I can see. I am not merely referring to the hon. Member who spoke this morning and told us what we should do in regard to food, clothing and housing; these are very important subjects but, if I may venture to say so, they are

Reply to debate in Parliament on the reference to a Select Committee of the Bill to amend the Constitution of India, New Delhi, May 18, 1951

totally irrelevant to the issue before the House. Apart from that, some other hon. Members of this House spoke with a great deal of vehemence and feeling about the restrictions on the press, the undermining of liberty and freedom, in fact, about the way the executive was arming itself with all kinds of powers. Not only hon. Members but some foreign newspapers have also talked about the Bill having imposed all kinds of restraints on the press and on the freedom of the individual. One hon. Member has alleged that this Bill treats the Constitution as a scrap of paper. Another hon. Member has talked about the sweeping restrictions on the press and yet another has said that this is the most undemocratic measure known to the world. Either the hon. Members have not taken the trouble to understand the contents of the Bill or they have deliberately misunderstood them. I put the Bill before the House with the firm conviction that such a measure is needed and I see no reason to apologize for this Bill.

What is this measure about which so much has been said? Listening to the speeches of the hon. Members I sometimes felt that they were play-acting. The other day, an hon. Member referred to some village plays, where the person who acted as Duryodhan later shaved off his moustache and re-appeared as Draupadi. It seems to me that some hon. Members are, in the same way, playing a number of roles in the course of the same speech.

I beg this House to understand the measure as it is and not to import other considerations into it. Many things are happening in this wide world and in this great country about which opinions may differ and they do differ but there is no reason why we should involve ourselves in this controversy.

I want the House to consider this measure coolly and dispassionately and I sincerely believe that, far from changing the Constitution, these amendments give full effect to the Constitution. What these amendments seek to introduce was implicit in the Constitution when we discussed it again and again in the Constituent Assembly. Indeed, it is implicit in similar constitutions and must be so, if the State is to endure.

Remember also that this measure has nothing to do with the making of any fresh law. That is for Parliament to do,

whether it be this Parliament or some other that may succeed it.

So, to talk of the executive as if it were trying to grab power is completely wide of the mark. Whatever decisions may be arrived at in Parliament, they will naturally have to abide by the Constitution.

Take some of the principal amendments. The second one seeks to amend Article 19(2) which refers to friendly relations with foreign Powers; it refers to security of the State and public order and then to incitement to violence. May I say that, when I spoke the last time, I did not go deeply into the wording of this clause? I rather dealt with the principle underlying it and with the difficulties we had to face. I did not deal with the wording, partly because I had hoped that we were going to appoint a Select Committee which would suggest a better wording, if necessary. Anyhow, we shall keep our minds open about the wording and, if fresh wisdom dawns upon us, we shall change it accordingly.

Then again, when it comes to the question of wording, we enter the legalistic sphere. I suppose I am enough of a lawyer to be able to say something about it, if necessary. But I feel that there are better lawyers here who could deal with it more effectively. Indeed, this morning we had a very able, a very exhaustive and illuminating address from my honourable colleague, the Law Minister. I would rather put to the House a slightly different approach to this question, for what we have sought to do in these amendments is partly implicit in the Constitution and partly explicit.

Take Article 19 (2). This itself is a restriction on the bald statement in Article 19 (1) (a). There is no such thing as one hundred per cent freedom for the individual to act as he wishes in any social group. This concept of individual freedom arose in the days of autocracy when an autocratic ruler or a group of rulers suppressed individual freedom. In a democratic society, the concept of individual freedom has to be balanced with social freedom and the relations of the individual with the social group. The individual must not infringe on the freedom of other individuals. In the Constitution the basic concept is given in Article 19(1) (a):

"All citizens shall have the right to freedom of speech and expression."

Clause (2) of the same Article says:

"Nothing in sub-clause (a) of clause (1) shall affect the operation of any existing law in so far as it relates to, or prevents the State from, making any law relating to libel, slander, defamation, contempt of court or any matter which offends against decency or morality or which undermines the security of, or tends to overthrow, the State."

Clause (2) is thus a restriction of the bald statement on freedom. This restriction does not mean that it is the only possible restriction—it merely indicates the nature of future restrictions. There may be a legitimate need for such restrictions. I will give you a rather ridiculous example to illustrate my point. Suppose, I choose to exercise my right of individual freedom by walking on the right side of the road and not on the left. The policeman will arrest me or I will be run over by a car and that will be the end of me. There are a hundred and one restrictions that limit individual freedom if you live in society. Clause (2) which covers libel, slander, morality, decency and the security of the State is not an exhaustive list of such restrictions. Others are either understood or implied. Normally, it might not have been necessary to say very much about these; but since some doubts have been raised about the implied restrictions, it has become necessary to remove them. Every State must have the right of, what Dr Ambedkar called, police power. Every State has to defend itself against an external enemy or an internal enemy and freedom has to be limited for that reason. The State has to defend itself and no constitution can take away that right from the State. It can restrict the unfair or partial exercise of that right. Therefore, clause (2) by itself cannot possibly be an exhaustive clause. Where there are no written constitutions and no fundamental rights, they naturally grow round the common law or are sometimes made explicit by Parliamentary enactment. Where there are written constitutions, these rights have been rendered explicit by judicial interpretations. Take the Constitution of the United States of America. In its beginning it was only an adaptation of the

colonial constitution framed by the British Power in America. It was based on the colonial constitution, as ours has been based on the Government of India Act of 1935. The extent to which the provisions of the 1935 Act have taken over in our Constitution is extraordinary. Had a new constitution been framed later by the United States, it would probably have been different. But they stuck to the old Constitution and through the process of judicial interpretation they incorporated what was implied in the existing Constitution. In the course of the last hundred and fifty years or more, conventions and interpretations which were implicit have been made explicit.

Our difficulty has been this: something that we considered to be implicit in the Constitution, something that seemed obvious, if looked at from the strictly narrow, legalistic and literal meaning of the words, is not implicit. Though a thing is obvious, it may not actually be implicit if you look at it in a legalistic way, as sometimes judges tend to. Unless you take a broad view, you will narrow the scope of the Constitution and limit the very ideas of the framers of the Constitution.

Nearly all the Members who are present in this House had a share in the framing of this Constitution and they will remember the long debates we have had in connection with it. We spent many months over it but that does not mean everything we did was perfect. No doubt, we shall learn by experience and try to remedy our mistakes. My first point, Sir, is this: that in the principal amendments that we seek to put forward, there is no attempt at changing the Constitution. We have only sought to bring out what is implicit and the need of which everybody, who considers the matter carefully and dispassionately, must also recognize. This especially applies to Article 19(2).

There are, in Article (2), the words "friendly relations with foreign States." In the course of a debate, reference was made to some Act of 1932. I looked it up: the Act provides against the publication of statements likely to prejudice the maintenance of friendly relations. This Act was originally meant to apply to the Indian States and the States outside

but adjoining India. In other words, it was meant for Afghanistan and Nepal plus the States in India. The purport of the Act is this: that before any action can be taken against a ruler in a court of law, the Government of India must authorize it. There is also a reference to the power of the State to stop publications, etc. This Act cannot be applied today because the Indian States have ceased to be. Of our two neighbouring countries, one is no longer a neighbour: with the other, we are on friendly terms. So far as I know, there is no other Act that can apply in this case. Therefore, unless Parliament passes legislation in the future with regard to friendly relations with foreign Powers, there will be no Act that can govern them. Even if there is no Act, some things are implicit as Dr Ambedkar has already pointed out. No matter how much freedom you may give a person, if an individual does something which might result in war, it is very serious indeed. No State, in the name of freedom, can submit to actions which may result in war and wholesale destruction. The State may sometimes act wrongly but you cannot take away its power to prevent anything happening which may lead to war. If the action of the State itself leads to war, obviously, the State is in the wrong and Parliament, in so far as it represents the State, should pull up the executive or change it. If Parliament itself goes wrong, then what should be done? Then that Parliament should be replaced by another Parliament. If the people go wrong, then there is no help for it.

Anyway, I am not aware of any State, democratic, semi-democratic or otherwise, which will not pull up a person or a group which threatens its security from within or without. Therefore, to frame laws in regard to relationship with foreign Powers is an inherent right of Parliament. I do maintain, with all respect, that nothing in the Fundamental Rights can take away that right, because it is the basic right of the State. It is especially so at a time when the world is faced with great difficulties, great tensions, great dangers and possibly with grave disasters. Can we ignore all this and think in terms of some academic exercise of the eighteenth century, forgetting that we are in the middle of the twentieth

century? I submit that the introduction of a provision about friendly relations with foreign Powers does not change the Constitution, does not extend it and does not limit individual freedom in the slightest degree.

In regard to foreign Powers, our policy, which this House has approved of on many occasions, is one of friendship and co-operation. Because it is a policy of friendship with other nations it becomes all the more necessary that we should not encourage activities which injure our relations with other Powers. Some hon. Members pointed out that things have been said in China or in Russia or in other countries that have been bitterly critical of individuals or the Government in this country. Our newspapers and our people have also used strong language sometimes. There is no question of ruling out criticism or strong language but there are times when criticism overshoots the mark and threatens disruption or endangers our international interests and relations.

And so, we have to intervene. In what way or in what measure is a matter for Parliament to determine, because there is no law at the present moment to control these things.

Let us take the other matter, namely, "friendly relations with foreign States and public order." As I have said, so far as the actual wording is concerned it can perhaps be improved. This is the best that we could put forward; in any case, it can be considered in the Select Committee but the fact remains that public order is as much a part of the security of the State as anything else. It is perfectly true that a government or a judicial officer may interpret these words widely or narrowly; they may be used when they should not be used. If you are formulating an Act, it is desirable that you use words precisely and definitely so that, as far as possible, they cannot be misused; but when you are enabling Parliament to function, then the question of narrowing and curtailing Parliament's powers does not arise. However, when Parliament passes an Act, you have to observe carefully that you do not go too far and do not allow a magistrate or a judge or somebody else to exercise more power than you want him to exercise. I can understand that; but you are merely defining the powers of Parliament and removing

doubts about them and the question of putting in a narrowing word does not arise. I am afraid we are mixing up the two ideas. We are looking at the subject as if it were an enactment giving certain powers to the executive. It is nothing of the kind. It is only an enactment which brings out the essential and inherent power of the State in regard to matters affecting the stability and security of the State and public order in the widest sense of the word; this inherent power of the State is merely mentioned in the Article. Why then has this amendment come up? It is because some doubts have been cast on it. I am quite sure that at the time of the making of this Constitution, if most of us had been asked about it, there would not have been any doubt in our minds; but in recent months some courts in the land have cast doubts and also differed. I think it was the Bihar High Court which said something to the effect that the preaching of murder is allowed under this clause. Some other judge has also agreed with this point of view. I think that Allahabad and Nagpur did not accept it. It may be that I am wrong about the names of the High Courts—anyhow there has been some disagreement and it is quite possible, as I said, that ultimately, in course of time, conventions and judicial interpretations will be established by the Supreme Court and other courts which will remove these doubts from the public mind. But, at the present moment, the doubts persist and the present moment is a difficult moment. Pandit Kunzru has asked whether any reference to the matter has been made to the Supreme Court by the Government. I would like to tell the hon. Member that no such reference has been made because the Government does not refer any matters of policy to the Supreme Court. It is only for Parliament and the Government to decide matters of policy. May I confess to a feeling of great surprise at the questions that my friend, the hon. Pandit Kunzru, has put? I have the example of a certain High Court having expressed a certain opinion or having given a decision that even the preaching of murder was justified. That, of course, is an extreme example. It does not cover the whole field. My honourable friend has pointed out that the decision of the High Court

followed from a previous ruling of the Supreme Court. Perhaps, it was so. If this matter were to go to the Supreme Court and should the Supreme Court decide that the preaching of murder is not allowed under the Constitution, the issue will be decided; but it will not have decided any general principle. A man will be able to preach that the hands or the feet of somebody be cut off because it is only the preaching of murder that is forbidden. Naturally, courts do not lay down broad policies. They give a ruling from the facts before them and give a certain opinion which we must accept and respect. Therefore, when questions of broad policies arise, you do not go to the courts. Parliament or the Government functioning under Parliament has to decide them. When a legal issue has to be interpreted, we go to the Supreme Court or some other court. Now, doubts have arisen. High Courts sometimes differ in their decisions. Even if the Supreme Court, in some cases, brings about a certain measure of uniformity, the uniformity is confined only to a particular issue. We shall have to wait for at least fifty or a hundred rulings on each issue before we can arrive at a consistent policy. That is the manner in which the American judicial interpretations have, in the course of a hundred and fifty years, brought about a certain uniformity. How can we do the same in the course of only a few months or years, when every day we are faced with dangers and have to meet a particular situation? Further, because doubts have arisen, because delays occur, because litigation goes on, because hundreds and thousands of applications are made to the Supreme Court burdening the honourable Judges with this work, because of all this we feel that it is desirable, in the interest of individual freedom, to define clearly this power that is implicit in the Constitution. It has ceased to be implicit because of these doubts and interpretations and, therefore, it has to be made explicit.

Take the words "incitement to an offence": I confess that the words, as they are, cover a wide field because the offence may be a minor or a major one. I would like to repeat that we are not, for the moment, dealing with an enactment on punishment but with the broad powers of Parliament. Are

you going to make a long list of offences to be incorporated in the Constitution? You cannot do it. It is very difficult and it will make it more and more rigid, with schedules of offences attached to it. You can do that sort of thing when you deal with a specific law. But here, we are merely indicating what was supposed to be implicit. We are making a broad generalization and the broad generalization may cover offences that are trivial. It is necessary, however, that when Parliament makes use of its authority or power, Parliament and hon. Members should see to it that there is no wrong application or misuse of it.

Dr S. P. Mookerjee referred to the validity of the laws in regard to Article 19(2) under which the existing law will be revalidated and given retrospective effect. I should like to tell him that all the existing laws were not made invalid by the Court's judgment. But as I understand the position, it is this: some judgment of the superior court might invalidate a particular law or a part of a law and, if this Bill is passed, it will, to the extent, remove the invalidity. To what extent a particular law is valid will depend, even now, on how it is interpreted. Let us, for instance, take the law of sedition. I cannot conceive that it will be allowed to function or can function in future, unless it comes under the clause of endangering the security of the State, etc., etc. As the House knows, we have been functioning for the last three and a half years as an independent country. It is longer than that—three years and ten months. And these judicial pronouncements have come only in the course of the last seven or eight months. In the course of these years—quite apart from these judicial pronouncements—how far have we had recourse to these laws? That is for the House to consider. I cannot give an answer straightaway. If my memory is to be trusted, we have hardly ever used them. Most of them have not been used and they cannot be used easily. Perhaps there were one or two odd cases here and there. But the fact is that they are of no value now and Parliament can either put an end to them or have them revised. First of all, the validity of the Act will be judged in accordance with the Constitution as amended. It does not automatically become

valid. If it does come within the scope of the amended Constitution, it will be considered valid; but from the strictly practical point of view, those Acts are not alive. If not wholly dead, they are half dead, though one or two might not be so. But generally speaking, there is no fear of their being misused.

The position, therefore, is that this House can take up these laws, put an end to them, modify them or do what it likes with them. There might be an interval, possibly of a few months; but there can be no fear that during these few months they will be misused. The press in India functions quite differently from the way it used to in the past. The press is not an external force. It is a powerful force but it is an internal force. Previously, it had to influence an alien government and the alien government could suppress it or injure it but today it is much more powerful for a variety of reasons. Though it is not of the Government, it is a part of Parliament, if I may say so. It can make a great deal of noise if any wrong is done to it. The hon. Deshbandhu Gupta wanted to know whether the Government would accept the recommendations made by the Press Laws Enquiry Committee—which were not accepted in view of the provision in the Constitution—and thereby relieve the anxiety of the press to some extent in the interim period. I regret to say that I have not seen the recommendations of the Press Laws Enquiry Committee and have no knowledge of them but the hon. Member will realize that this question can arise only if this law is passed.

Repeated reference has been made to the freedom of the press. I venture to say that, so far as I am concerned and so far as our Government is concerned, we believe entirely in the freedom of the press. Mr Deshbandhu Gupta was good enough to read out extracts from the speech I delivered some time ago. I completely accept what I said then and I am prepared to repeat it now: but in repeating it, I may say that in that very speech I also drew the attention of the press to various things that were happening in connection with the press in India and appealed to them to put an end to them. Another thing I wanted to mention was this: we talk of the

freedom of the press. What exactly do we mean by it? Today freedom only means suppression or lack of suppression by governmental authority. When gigantic newspaper chains spring up and undermine the freedom of the independent newspapers, when the press in India is controlled by three or four groups of individuals, what kind of press is that?

I shall now come to Article 31, 31A and 31B. May I remind the House or such Members of the House as were also Members of the Constituent Assembly about the long debates that we had on this issue? The entire object of these Articles in the Constitution was to take away the question of *zamindari* and land reform from the purview of the Courts. We put in some proviso in regard to Article 31. It was deliberately excluded from the jurisdiction of the Courts. Now, how does it come under their jurisdiction?

Here the Bihar High Court comes in. The Bihar High Court brings in Article 14, of all articles, to apply it to a question of land reform. Article 14 says:

"The State shall not deny to any person equality before the law or the equal protection of the laws within the territory of India."

Here I am reminded that one has to respect the majesty of the law. The majesty of the law is such that it looks with an even eye on the millionaire and the beggar. Whether it is a millionaire or a beggar who steals a loaf of bread the sentence is the same. It is all very well to talk about the equality of the law for the millionaire and the beggar but the millionaire has not much incentive to steal a loaf of bread, while the starving beggar has. This business of the equality of law may very well mean, as it has come to mean often enough, the making of existing inequalities rigid by law. This is a dangerous thing and it is still more dangerous in a changing society. It is completely opposed to the whole structure and method of this Constitution and what is laid down in the Directive Principles.

What are we to do about it? What is the Government to do? If a Government has not even the power to legislate to bring about equality gradually, the Government fails to do what it has been commanded to do by the Constitution.

That is why I said that the amendments I have placed before the House are meant to give effect to the Constitution. I am not changing the Constitution by an iota: I am merely making it stronger. I am merely giving effect to the real intentions of the framers of the Constitution and to the wording of the Constitution unless of course it is interpreted very narrowly. Looking at the narrow issue that came up in Madras, I shall say that this amendment is not intended to be a communal amendment. We must distinguish between the communal approach and the approach of helping our weaker and more backward brothers and sisters. And, although it is my amendment, I don't particularly like the words "backward class of citizens" and I hope the Select Committee will find some better wording. What I mean is this: it is the backward individual citizen that we should help. Why should we brand groups and classes as backward and forward? It is a fact that certain groups or classes are backward but I do not wish to brand them as such or treat them as such.

In this connection, may I say that a group or class which, perhaps, deserves greater sympathy from this House is the tribal folk, whether in the North-East Frontier tract or in Central India or elsewhere? Many of our colleagues in this House represent the Scheduled Castes and not only help us in our work but keep us informed of the needs of the Scheduled Castes. However, we have very few persons in this House to speak for the Scheduled Tribes. Therefore, it should be the special concern and care of this House to look after the interests of the Scheduled Tribes and their advancement in every way and when we add these words to Article 15, we certainly include the Scheduled Tribes.

In regard to Article 31B, I don't think I need say much. Some doubts did arise because of the judgment of the Allahabad High Court in regard to the nationalization of public transport services. Now, we have been following a policy which is normally called a policy of 'mixed' economy. We encourage private enterprise and, at the same time, we widen the activities of the State in these matters; that is to say, there is more and more nationalization or socialization

of services. It is essential, therefore, that the State should have the power to nationalize. Even in a country like the United States of America, which is committed to the individualistic and capitalistic form of government more than any other country, you will find that the progressive socialization of public utilities and the like is going on. The progress made so far has been very considerable. But in this country and in countries like India where private enterprise, howsoever you may encourage it, is limited in scope and resources, the State must inevitably come in. The State must have the power to nationalize completely or partly anything that it takes up and that is why this elucidation has been put in.

We have heard a great deal about democracy and about freedom in the course of this debate. In newspapers outside this country some of us, especially I, have been criticized for forgetting our stand in the past. Well, it is very difficult to judge oneself and it may be that unconsciously some of us have erred; but I am not aware of that fact. So far as we are concerned, we still try to act up to our ideals of democracy and freedom. But it was rather a mixed pleasure to me to hear democracy and freedom being praised by some hon. Members in this House who were not particularly associated with these concepts in the past—in fact, who opposed them. Anyhow, this is a welcome change and we hope it will lead to a better understanding between us in the future.

One thing rather surprised me. I think it was Dr Kunzru who asked: 'Why do you make these changes when you have got the Preventive Detention Act?' First of all, these changes do not give us any power to do anything; but apart from that, Dr Kunzru and this House will not like the use of the Preventive Detention Act all the time or at any time for the matter of that, unless they are compelled by circumstances to use it for a short while. So, to rely on that as a stand-by is a dangerous thing. We want to put an end to it and not use it as far as possible.

I hope, therefore, that this House will agree to refer this Bill to Select Committee. I might add that I should have liked to have as much co-operation from the House as possible

in this Select Committee but one cannot have an indefinite number of Members. We selected twenty-one, I believe. I would gladly have added a few more but, at this moment, I have to confine myself to that figure. If one goes on adding, I do not quite know where it will stop. We have also invited a number of other Members to assist us and I hope they will do so. I beg to move, Sir, that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

EQUALITY AND THE BACKWARD CLASSES

THE SELECT Committee has considered the matter of amending the Constitution for six days; and yet, to say that it was considered for six days does not perhaps convey the right impression, because the amount of time and thought given by the Committee to this matter probably represents more than six days. The Committee consisted of many hon. Members of this House and represented a variety of opinion. Each member pressed—quite rightly—the particular view he held with all the force at his command. It was our desire to come to an understanding in this Committee and we attempted to fulfil it as far as we could. It was a serious matter. Indeed, every amendment in the Constitution is a serious matter. Our attempt was to find common ground and may I say that, in effect, we did find it in a great measure. Even though a number of minutes of dissent are attached to this report, I think that the agreement we found in the course of our deliberations was far greater than might be thought by a casual reader of these minutes. I am trying to point out that we approached this question, not in a partisan spirit but in a spirit of understanding. We weighed and balanced the opinions of our critics and tried to find a way out which would, as far as possible, be satisfactory to all concerned. I

Speech in Parliament while moving the resolution "That the Bill to amend the Constitution of India, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration", New Delhi, May 29, 1951

think, on the whole, we succeeded. Therefore, the report that I presented to the House is, I believe, an improvement on the original Bill that I placed before the House. Opinions may differ and it is often seen that, where there is an attempt to find a middle way, there is a certain dissatisfaction on either side. But I think the report does represent a very hard and continuous attempt to express our intentions in as good a language as possible, without doing any violence to the spirit of the Constitution. Indeed, as I said at an earlier stage, the amendments we sought to put in, irrespective of how they were worded, were meant more to clarify than to change any part of the Constitution. Naturally, any amplification would, of necessity, involve some change in the interpretation; nevertheless, we constantly kept in view the spirit which animates the Constitution.

In the minutes of dissent, stress is laid on the fact that the Constitution has only been in existence for sixteen months and that the period is too short to warrant an amendment already. I would not venture to criticize that statement. And yet, I think that, in this connection, the period of sixteen months has little bearing on the subject. The presumption is that we would be in a better position to judge after sixteen years. No doubt, we shall be— if we are still there. It has often been said to those who always talk about 'the long run' that they will all be dead by then, anyhow. The question is not whether the Constitution has been in existence for months or for years but rather what requires to be done. We have had some experience and the conditions that face us have made it desirable that certain changes be made. The fact that the Constitution is only sixteen months old should not count at all. Therefore, our only consideration should be whether such a change is necessary or not.

A fair number of amendments have been suggested and, as the House knows, many of them are of rather a technical nature. They attempt to overcome some slight difficulty that had arisen, without interfering with the basic provisions of the Constitution. There are, in fact, two or three matters that are considered more important and more basic—those relating specially to Articles 19, 31 and 15. I do not want to

take the time of the House at this stage by referring to the other Articles in the report, because there is little dissent in regard to them, although an honourable member of the Select Committee has objected to the phraseology in one or two places. But the meaning behind them is accepted and if it is necessary to change the phraseology by a word here or a word there in order to bring out the meaning more clearly, surely we shall have no objection. We have tried to give it the best wording we could think of.

I come, now, to deal with those three specific Articles on which a great deal of argument has turned.

There is Article 15(2) or 15(4) as it is proposed to be made now, that is to say, the Article which says that nothing in Article 15(2) or Article 29(2) should come in the way of our making special provisions for certain groups or classes which are not specifically defined.

I wonder if the House remembers that, when I referred to this matter earlier, I mentioned that a small but rather important matter had been left out by an oversight in the Bill as it was printed. At that time, the clause relating to Article 15 said: "Nothing in Article 15(2) will come in the way of..." and so on. In fact, what we had decided to say was—"nothing in Article 15 and in Article 29(2) will come in the way of, etc." Unfortunately the words "Article 29(2)" had been left out owing to a slight error. I mention this merely to indicate that this was not an afterthought on our part. It was an error for which I take my full share of responsibility. It was not an afterthought to include Article 29(2) because we had decided to do so before actually putting it in the Bill. There were two views in regard to Article 29(2). Many eminent people think that Article 29(2) does not come in the way at all in this particular context. Even so, a certain doubt remained in the people's minds. We wanted to remove this doubt. Without going into the details of this Article or of the amendment proposed, I wish to say a few words about—shall I say—our basic ideas on this subject. Why have we done this? Why has it been thought that these Articles come in the way of our doing something that we wish to do? The House knows very well that this matter came up in this

particular form because of certain happenings in Madras; therefore, there is no need to try and hush it up. The Government of Madras State had issued a G.O.—I don't know its details—according to which certain reservations were made for certain classes and communities. The High Court of Madras said that this G.O. was not in order, that it was against both the spirit and the letter of the Constitution. Now, I don't for an instant challenge the right of the High Court of Madras to give this decision. Indeed, from a certain point of view it seems to me, if I may say so with all respect, that their argument was quite sound and perfectly valid. That is to say, if communities as such are brought into the picture, it does go against certain explicit or implied provisions of the Constitution. Nevertheless, while it is quite valid and we bow to the decision of the High Court of Madras in this matter, the fact remains that we are faced with a situation for which the present generation is not to blame. Therefore, some sort of special provisions must be made. We have to do something for the communities which are backward educationally, economically and in other respects, if we wish to encourage them in these matters. We come up against the difficulty that, on the one hand, in our Directive Principles of Policy we talk of removing inequalities, of raising the people in every way, socially, educationally and economically, of reducing the distances which separate the groups or classes of individuals from one another; on the other, we find ourselves handicapped in this task by certain provisions in the Constitution.

An hon. Member has asked in his minute of dissent as to whom are we thinking of when we talk of people or groups as backward. After all, as he points out, 80 per cent of our people are backward in all these respects. This is perfectly true; but it does not alter the fact that we have to tackle the problem of backwardness. It is no good saying that because 80 per cent of our people are backward we shall simply accept the position and do nothing. We have to give them opportunities—economic, educational and other. Now, in wanting to do so we find that we are up against certain provisions in the Constitution regarding equality and non-

discrimination. We arrive at a peculiar tangle, namely, that we cannot have equality because in trying to attain equality we come up against certain principles of equality laid down in the Constitution. That is a very peculiar position. We cannot have equality because we cannot have non-discrimination, for if you are thinking of raising those who are down, you are somehow affecting the status quo, undoubtedly. You are thus said to be discriminating because you are affecting the status quo. If this argument is correct, then we cannot make any major change in the status quo, whether in the economic or in any other sphere. Clearly, whatever law you may make, you have to make some change somewhere.

Take another very important objective of ours: the attempt to realize an egalitarian or some other form of society in which the differences based on birth or income or position are not great. In our attempt to achieve it, we want to put an end to all those infinite divisions that have arisen in our social life; I am referring to the caste system and other religious divisions, call them by whatever name you like. There are, of course, economic divisions also; we are conscious of them and we try to deal with them, though not always very satisfactorily. It is thus one of our objectives to get rid of these and to give every individual in India an opportunity to grow as also to build up a united nation where the individuals do not think so much of their particular group or caste but of the community at large. While, however, that may be our objective, the fact remains that these large numbers of divisions and fissures in our social life still exist, though I think they are becoming fewer and fewer. We are gradually obliterating all those hard and fast laws that divide us; nevertheless, the process is slow and we cannot ignore the present altogether. We cannot ignore the existing facts. Therefore, one has to keep a balance between the facts as we find them and the objective and ideal that we aim at. If we stick to the existing facts alone, then we are static and unchanging and shall be giving up our objectives and the Directive Principles of Policy laid down in the Constitution. That, of course, we cannot do and must not do. On the other

hand, if we talk only about the Directive Principles and ignore the existing facts, then we may talk logic and even find sense in a way but what we say will have little relation to the facts.

Hence, we must find a middle way between our objectives and the existing facts. We must keep our ideal in view and then take steps which will gradually carry us in that direction. At the same time, we must not ignore the existing facts. We have to deal with the existing facts anyhow, even if it means fighting the existing situation.

The House will, surely, appreciate our difficulties and understand that in grappling with this problem it is possible to lay emphasis on this aspect or that aspect of it. Both aspects are important and the real difficulty arises in finding a balance between the two. Nor can we find that balance by saying 'aye' or 'nay' as some hon. Members seem to think. Normally, problems cannot be answered so easily. We have to consider them in their relation to a hundred other things before we can bring the ideal into some relation with the actual. These were the considerations at the back of our minds when we discussed the matter in the Select Committee.

I think I may say with perfect truth that every single member of the Select Committee recognized the desirability of giving an opportunity for growth to those who may, in any sense, be considered backward. Some members were, however, afraid that any provision that may be made to this end would be abused and utilized for the benefit of the very communal divisions that have done us so much injury. This fact, very rightly, troubled their minds as it must trouble the minds of each one of us. As I said, we tried to find a middle way and I submit that in the wording we have adopted for the Article in question, we have found a way of meeting the difficulty more or less successfully.

You must have read the paragraph in the report which says: ".....it might well be said that with the object of this amendment of the Constitution there is practically unanimous agreement here. The only difference comes in sometimes, to a slight extent in regard to certain apprehensions that it arouses. It was for this reason that even in the Select

Committee's Report we drew attention to these fears and apprehensions and said that we were quite sure that the Select Committee is of the view that this provision is not likely to be, and cannot indeed be, misused by any Government for perpetuating any class discrimination or for treating non-backward classes as backward for the purpose of conferring privileges on them."

We earnestly hope that if and when this provision is passed, it will not be misused. Nobody can give a guarantee against its misuse. We can only try our best to create the conditions where such misuse may not be made. What I wish to assure this House about is this, that we are alive to the possibility that this Article may be used for a purpose to which we are opposed. May I add that when we talked with certain members, including the Chief Minister of the Madras Government, they told us that they realized and appreciated our difficulty and assured us that they had no desire to use it in any objectionable way? Hence, I would commend this particular amendment of Article 15 to the House.

I come now to Article 19(2), which has perhaps given rise to more comment and controversy than any other suggested amendment. I believe that two or more honourable members of the Select Committee have protested and raised objections to the fact that they were not supplied with a list of the laws that would be affected by these changes. Most of these laws find a place in one of the schedules that have recently been passed. Therefore, every one of them is easily available. These laws were considered carefully by our Law Department. In regard to the other laws, however, I have not quite understood the complaint or, if I may say so, having understood it partly, I have not quite been able to see what I can do about it. It is exceedingly difficult to make a list of all the laws which might be affected. There are some that I can mention straight off and tell you what effect this amendment will have on a particular law or a part of that law. I can do that in cases where the Supreme Court or the High Court has already given a ruling. Even in such cases I do not know exactly what the position will be. It is not as though we were suddenly resuscitating or reviving some laws

that have become obsolete, disabled or blocked. We wish, in certain cases, to change the interpretation given by some of our superior courts. What effect that change in the interpretation will have on any particular law cannot be decided by us. Ultimately, it can only be decided by the superior courts of the land as to what effect this particular amendment, when passed, will have on a particular law. My view in these matters will not be final; it will only be an opinion which I might give with my limited knowledge of the law.

I speak with great respect when I have to deal with the law, because I have not only great respect for the judges but also great fear of the lawyers. Take, for instance, Section 153A of the Indian Penal Code which deals with what might be called communal discord or the preaching of enmity between the communities. The amendment we seek to introduce relates to the question of how such discord can be dealt with. If this amendment is passed, the preaching of communal hatred can certainly be controlled.

Let us take Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code. So far as I am concerned, that particular Section is highly objectionable and obnoxious. It should be given no place in our Constitution for reasons, both practical and historical. The sooner we get rid of it the better. We might deal with the subject of this Section in other ways, in more limited ways, as every other country does but that particular Section as it is should have no place, because all of us have had enough experience of it in a variety of ways. Apart from the fact that the logic of the situation does not warrant it, our instincts are against it. Suppose you pass an amendment relating to a particular Article of the Constitution, surely, that particular Article will not put an end to the spirit, the language and the objectives of the Constitution. It will only clear up any point that may arise in connection with that particular Article.

In so far as the question of reviving the laws is concerned, I would like to say that this is only a matter of removing certain obstructions that have arisen. An object in seeking this amendment is, first of all, that we shall be able to deal with the situation effectively; secondly, by considering the whole matter afresh, we shall be able to put an end to those

old laws which are objectionable. Indeed, some of the old laws are such that it became difficult for us to seek any new legislation even in this matter. The House will remember that there was a Committee known as the Press Laws Enquiry Committee. This Committee made certain recommendations and it was stated by some Members here and many people outside that these recommendations had been rejected *in toto* by the Government or by the Home Minister. The fact of the matter is that many of these recommendations were completely pointless according to the interpretation of certain courts, the ruling of which we were bound to accept as correct. We could either accept those interpretations or accept the recommendations. If you pass this amendment, then the recommendations—if, of course, you approve of them—can be considered as capable of being effective. To my mind, these recommendations do not go far enough in some respects. But this is a matter of judgment and personal opinion.

As I stated earlier, it was not our desire to curb or restrain the freedom of the press when we brought forward these amendments. That, of course, is no excuse if the words in the amendments actually do so. I realize this and I know that it is folly for a government to say 'but that was far from our minds' of a consequence that inevitably follows an action taken by the Government. Nevertheless, I should like to repeat that we had no intentions of curbing the freedom of the press. We are dealing with a difficult situation; and for a variety of reasons, both national and international, it grows more difficult every day. It was not merely in terms of curbing the press that we thought of this problem but in much wider terms. We had also been considering the question of the press at the same time; we wanted to deal with it separately, in consultation with the people concerned, to put an end to some old laws and introduce something that was more in conformity with modern practices. However, it is perfectly true that this amendment affects the freedom of the press to some extent. It does so in two ways: directly and indirectly. The amendment may obstruct the press in theory directly or it may give to the Government a chance to impose certain disabilities. I recognize both the possibilities. As far as we are

concerned, we do not wish to take advantage of this change in order to curb the freedom of the press; nor do we wish any State Government to do so. We wish to review the whole scheme as soon as possible; but I would beg of you to consider the matter both from the point of view of theory and that of practice.

Great exception has been taken to some additional phrases in Article 19(2). First of all, may I draw your attention to a major change? Although the change is the addition of one word only, it is a major change. I am referring to the introduction of the word "reasonable" which can be interpreted to mean that everything done is patently justiciable. I would like to point out that even without the introduction of this word every part of the Constitution, within some limitations, is always justiciable. Therefore, whether the word "reasonable" was there or not, the matter could have gone to a court of law and could have been interpreted by our superior Courts. It is true that their interpretation would have been limited by the changes that we have made. Nothing can, however, take away their power to consider any part of the Constitution and to give their opinion. But an amendment can certainly be phrased so as to direct attention along a particular channel. Suppose the word "reasonable" was absent from all the various sub-clauses of Article 19, as, in fact, it is absent from the various sub-clauses, it would not mean that the idea underlying the word "reasonable" was also absent. It is there, although the word may be absent. However, I shall not go into a technical argument. My point is that, whatever the power the Court might have had, certainly the introduction of the word "reasonable" gives the Court direct authority to consider this matter.

The question may be asked why we did not introduce the word "reasonable" earlier. The reason was not that we wished to prevent the Courts from coming into the picture and giving their interpretation. We only wanted to avoid an excess of litigation, we wanted to avoid the hundreds and, perhaps, thousands, of references that would constantly have been made by odd individuals and groups, thereby holding up the working of the State and producing, in addition,

confusion in people's minds at a time when such confusion might do grave injury to the State.

An hon. Member has said that this is a matter of Fundamental Rights. Does he mean to say that a matter of Fundamental Rights ought to be allowed to lead not only to confusion but to grave danger to the State? Surely not. No single fundamental right can survive any grave danger to the State. And I want the House to be clear about this and realize the nature of the times we live in, in this country and in other countries, and not to quote so often the ancient scripts and maxims that belong to the time of the French Revolution and the American Revolution. Many things have happened since then. It is odd that some of my honourable friends have taken umbrage at the amendment in the Constitution and held that the Constitution is something sacred. Some of them or their colleagues outside this House have openly stated that the first thing they would do if they came to power is to scrap this Constitution. That is a curious position to take—that this Constitution has to be scrapped just as this Parliament has to be scrapped and something new has to come in its place. What we want to do is not to change it but to amend it slightly.

Some hon. Members who have recorded their dissent have referred to the sacred and sacrosanct character of the Constitution. A constitution must be respected, if there is to be any stability in the land. A constitution must not be made the plaything of fickle fortune. All this is true. At the same time, it should be remembered that we have in India a strange habit of making gods of various things and adding them to our vast pantheon. Having given them our theoretical worship, we do exactly the reverse of what we should. If we want to kill something in this country we deify it first. That is largely the habit in this country.

So, if you wish to kill this Constitution, make it sacred and sacrosanct. If you want it to be a dead thing, not a growing thing, a static, unwieldy, unchanging thing, then by all means do so, realizing that it is the best way of destroying it. For, however good the ideas of the philosophers of the 18th and the early 19th century might have been—and they are

very good—the world has changed and grown beyond them within a hundred years. The world has changed mightily in the course of your generation and mine and we have seen great wars and great revolutions. We have seen the most perfect of constitutions upset, not because they lacked perfection but because they lacked reality, because they failed to deal with the real problems of the day. Do you know of any better framed or better phrased constitution than the Constitution of the Weimar Republic—the German Constitution? It was perfect in wording, phraseology, balance and adjustment. Yet, that whole constitution went, lock, stock and barrel. Away it vanished into the dustbin of history.

Do you know of a better constitution than that of the Republic of Spain which unhappily was killed, assassinated about 11 or 12 years ago? It was a magnificent constitution. It went so far as to say that it would not go to war with any country or make treaty with any foreign country unless the League of Nations of the day permitted it to do so or agreed to its doing so. It was a constitution breathing a fine spirit of idealism. Yet, those fine idealists who framed it are spread over the far corners of the world and that constitution has no place in Spain.

I have given you two instances; I could give you any number of them from every country of Europe and many countries of Asia. Do not imagine, therefore, that because we have passed a constitution and because we call it sacred and sacrosanct, we have necessarily given it stability. Do not also imagine that anything that is considered by you stable is necessarily so. If it is true that country and a community grow—they are not static—then surely conditions arise which should be dealt with in a way different from the old one.

Do you wish India to continue as it is? Surely not. You want industrial growth, you want social equality, you want all kinds of things to happen here. You have yourself laid them down in the Directive Principles. And as I said on the last occasion, the real difficulty we have to face is a conflict between the dynamic ideas contained in the Directive Principles of Policy and the static position of certain things that are called 'fundamental', whether they relate to property

or to something else. Both are important undoubtedly. How are you to get over the difficulty? A constitution which is unchanging and static—it does not matter how good it is, how perfect it is—is a constitution that has outlived its use. It is in its old age already and gradually approaching its death. A constitution to be living must be growing, must be adaptable, must be flexible, must be changeable. And if there is one thing which the history of political developments has pointed out, it is this. The great strength of the British people has resided in their flexible constitution. They have known how to adapt themselves to the biggest changes, constitutionally. Sometimes they went through the process of fire and revolution. Even then they tried to adapt their constitution to the new conditions and went their way. An hon. Member wanted to remind me of a fact that had not escaped me, namely, that they have no written constitution. We in this country could not obviously emulate the British in having an unwritten constitution. We cannot do that, especially in a big country with numerous autonomous provinces and States. Nevertheless, the other extreme of a rigid constitution, too, is a dangerous one, which might lead to the break-up of that constitution. Life is a curve—it is not a straight line—and the life of a nation is even more of a curve in these changing times. Logical and straight lines are tangents which go off the curve and if the tangent is too far away from the curve of life and the curve of a nation's life, then there is conflict and upheaval. Something new emerges because you come back, as you must, to the line of life because you cannot depart too far from it. So, if you are flexible in your action and constitution, then you are nearer the living curve of a nation's growth.

We live in a haunted age. I do not know how many hon. Members have that sense and that feeling of ghosts and apparitions surrounding us, ideas, passions, hatred, violence, preparations for war, many things which you cannot grip but which are, nevertheless, dangerous. We live in an age in which vast numbers of people in various countries are frustrated, because they see no light, because they see before them the danger of a future war and the break-up of the

world. Hon. Members tell me that this Constitution has been in existence for fourteen months. Can any Member tell me what the fate of the world will be in another fourteen months? I cannot. As a matter of fact, nobody can, except that it will be very different from what it is today. And, that is a big thing to say. In regard to this country, too, I venture to say that another fourteen months will see many changes—and big changes, too. Whether they will be for good or for evil, I do not know. As Mr Gokhale said, you cannot enchain the growth of a country; and if you think you can do so with words and phrases, you are quite wrong.

These amendments that we have placed before you are an attempt to achieve a balance between stability and flexibility, between idealism and realism, between the conditions in the country as we see them today and the dangers that may confront us. We have, at the same time, tried to remain faithful to the entire spirit of the Constitution, the spirit which ensures us freedom, the freedom of the press and various other freedoms.

Some people seem to think that the object of these amendments is somehow connected with the coming elections. I confess that when I first heard this—it might have been a legitimate inference for some people—it came as a great surprise to me, because the idea had not struck me at all. In fact, may I confess that I do not get excited about the elections at all? I have never been excited about the elections. The coming elections, which are going to be colossal, are not likely to excite me either. But if the House or the country does not trust our bona fides, then no word of mine will help. I can assure the House, however, that none of us, to my knowledge, has the least notion that this had anything to do with the elections as such.

The fact that elections are soon to be held may create a situation in the country which will be dangerous from the point of view of security. And if I or anybody who is responsible for the security of the country thinks that he can deal with it in a particular way, then it is his duty to come to this House and say so. At a time when the country has to be saved from going to pieces, it would hardly be relevant to discuss

what the particular phraseology of the Constitution should be.

If such a contingency arises, no word will be allowed to come in the way. Have you forgotten what happened three and a half years ago, in this city of Delhi, in the Punjab, in the entire body of Western Pakistan? This Constitution was not there then. Where was freedom at that time? Not constitutional freedom but the freedom of normal human impulses. Do you think any constitution will prevent me from dealing with such a situation? Certainly not, because if it does, the country will go to pieces and the Constitution with it. I want to be perfectly fair to this House and to the country in declaring that, if I am responsible and the Government is responsible, anything that goes to disrupt the community, anything that creates communal discord in this country will be put down with a heavy hand. There has been enough of loose talk about this. It is for this country and for this House to have or not to have this Government. But these are the terms on which the Government can agree to remain.

The press has said a great deal about its liberty. I know something of the press because I have been connected with it in some ways. Therefore, I cannot understand the apprehensions of the press. Yet, I must say it has been unfair to this Government in what it has said. The press, if it wants freedom—which it ought to have—must also have some balance of mind which it seldom possesses. One cannot have it both ways.

Every freedom in this world is limited, limited not so much by law as by circumstances. We do not wish to come in the way of the freedom of the press. Personally, I am convinced of the importance of the freedom of the press. I have said this previously. I believe a pamphlet containing a speech of mine delivered some time ago has been circulated and I repeat that I stand by every word of what I have said about the freedom of the press. I hope that, in so far as I can, I shall be able to help in maintaining that freedom. But I care a little more for the freedom of India and I am not going to allow anything to come in the way of the freedom and unity of India. I do not, of course, mean to say that the freedom of the press comes in the way of the freedom of India.

Not that. But we have to look at things in their proper perspective and not behave as though we were in a court of law, arguing this or that case. We are legislators sitting in Parliament with the fate of this nation in our hands, possibly, to some extent, the fate of other nations also. It is a difficult and highly responsible position and we cannot afford to be moved by passion or prejudice or by a chain of thought which has no relation to reality.

Therefore, we have to consider these matters in all seriousness, remembering always that certain freedoms have to be preserved. It is dangerous to weaken them even in the flush of excitement. At the same time, while we want freedom, freedom of the press or freedom of speech or freedom of anything, we have to remember that the nation must remain free, the individual must be free and the country must be free. If national freedom is imperilled or individual freedom is imperilled, what good are other freedoms? Because, then, the very basis of freedom is gone. So all these things must be weighed. Perhaps, the balance we suggest is not a correct balance. But it is no good saying vaguely that freedom has been attacked and weakened.

The House will remember—a fact that has been repeatedly stated—that this amendment is an enabling one, it is not a law. Had a law been before the House, each word of it would have been considered very carefully. Naturally, when you give an enabling power, it is given in slightly wider terms. Let us take 'friendly relations with foreign States'; it would be difficult to say what would amount to a danger to friendly relations. You may specify and say that "defamatory attacks on the heads of foreign nations or others" will be a danger to friendly relations with foreign governments. Once you have made sure that the attack you are going to make is not unreasonable, it is best that you use gentle language. Anyhow, during the last three years or so, I am not aware—I may be wrong—that any action has been taken anywhere in regard to the criticism of foreign countries or foreign policy. So far as I am concerned and so long as I have anything to do with it, I can assure you that you can criticize to your heart's content the foreign policy that my Government

pursues or the policy of any country; but if you do something which seems to us to be an incitement to war, do you think we ought to remain quiet and simply wait for the war to come? I am sure no country would do that.

We cannot imperil the safety of the whole nation in the name of some fancied freedom which puts an end to all freedom. Therefore, we should naturally like to avoid what might be called defamatory attacks against leading foreign personalities. You can criticize as much as you like either our policy or any other country's policy but you must always keep in mind that the affairs of the world are in a very delicate state and words, whether oral or written, count; they make a difference for good or for evil. A word said out of place may create a grave situation, as it often does. In fact, it would be a good thing, I think, if most statesmen dealing with foreign affairs became quiet for a few months. It would be a still better thing if newspapers became quiet for a few months, too. It would be best of all if everybody was quiet for a few months. However, these are pious aspirations which I fear will not be accepted or acted up to; but we live in dangerous times and I wish the House to consider them in dealing with Article 19(2). In the Select Committee, we examined it in a variety of ways. You will remember that the word "reasonable" was not there at first. We tried to redraft it completely, more on the lines of the words in Article 2 of the Constitution. In the present form of words, there is no mention of 'restrictions'. So, we thought that we had better proceed on that line and then we tried naturally to limit the various subjects mentioned here—I should be quite frank with you—for instance in regard to friendly relations with foreign Powers, we sought to put in the words "defamatory attacks on heads of foreign States" plus such other attacks which might impair the friendly relations with foreign States. Now, that is obviously limited and that is all that one wants and so we went on limiting the other subjects. We produced a new draft at that time. Then we looked at it and we found that while some people liked this part of the draft better, some preferred the other; but nobody seemed to like the whole thing as it was and so we thought: Let us go back to

our old draft but with a very major change, that is, with the addition of the word "reasonable" which really, immediately and explicitly limits everything that you do and put it to the Courts to determine whether it is reasonable or not. It is a big addition. As I said, it is not the Courts we are afraid of. There are courts of eminent judges but what really frightens me a little is the tremendous volume and bulk of litigation that this kind of thing encourages.

There is one more thing. My colleague, Srimati Durgabai, has put in a note in which she has argued that these changes should be made by Parliament and not by the States. I am wholly in sympathy with her desire but my mind is not quite clear about the legal aspects of the matter. I think it would be a very good thing if lawyers assured me that there are no difficulties in the way. Then again, another member of the Select Committee has suggested that the President can certify the bills after they have been passed by the State Legislatures. That is a suggestion which we can consider. These are not matters of basic principles, because we want two things: some power to deal with a critical situation if and when it should arise; and checks so that this power may not be misused. We want both. It is impossible to do these things perfectly; one has to find a middle way and trust to luck that the people who exercise that power will be sensible, reasonable and wise. As a matter of fact, the Governments, whether at the Centre or in the States, have today a great deal of power. If they misuse it, they can do a lot of mischief in a hundred ways. Ultimately, the check consists in the fall of the Government and the liquidation of parliamentary democracy in the country. The only thing that can act as a real check is for us to choose people who are likely to behave in a reasonable and wise way.

I need not draw your attention to the fact that not only has the word "reasonable" been taken out of Article 19 but two or three lines have gone out, too. This, I think, has improved the Article greatly, made it more concise and brought the whole scope of the Article within the word "reasonable".

Then I come to Article 31. Here some minor changes

have been made. I need not go far into them; but there is one thing which I should particularly like to say. Some hon. Members, I believe, have given notice of amendments to add other laws to the Ninth Schedule. I would beg of them not to press this matter. It is not with any great satisfaction or pleasure that we have produced this long Schedule. Nor do we wish to add to it and that for two reasons. One is that the Schedule consists only of a particular type of legislation generally speaking and no other type should come in. Secondly, every single measure included in it was carefully considered by our President and certified by him, every measure except the last one, I think. And that last one was independently examined by us quite comprehensively. It has gone through a process of examination, analysis and scrutiny and we are responsible for it. If you go on adding at the last moment, it is not fair, in my opinion, either to this Parliament or to the country.

Article 31 refers principally to the abolition of the *zamindari* system, which has been a basic programme of the country for a long time. I am not speaking at the moment from any partisan or party point of view—although the matter is important enough in the sense that, if we are pledged to something, we should give effect to it—but from larger considerations. I would beg the House to consider that the basic problem in Asia today is the agrarian problem. Quite apart from its intimate relationship with the food problem, if we delay in giving effect to it, as we have done, we shall get entangled in all manner of difficulties from which we might not be able to extricate ourselves.

I should like to say that in regard to this matter there has been a fair amount of litigation. In fact, it is due to litigation that some of these difficulties have arisen. I cannot blame the people for going to law courts to get such protection as they think they can get: I am not blaming the *zamindars* for doing so. They have every right to do so and profit by it. But I would like to put it to them and to others that their security ultimately lies in a stable economic system and not in the law courts or in anything else. If there is no peace between them and the vast agrarian population, they have no security. That system cannot continue: it does not matter what your

Fundamental Rights might say, what your Constitution might say or what your courts might say. If you refuse to see beyond these you will arrive at a revolutionary situation which will ignore all these things. We have to consider the reality and re-adjust ourselves, put an end to the big *zamindari* system, reform our land system, make it progressive and modernize it, keeping at the same time the old ways also and not uprooting the community from its ways.

Now, a balance has to be created. In creating that balance, recourse to the law courts for redress will be of little avail. If this amendment is passed, the State Governments concerned will have a certain power to go ahead with the laws that they have already passed. If I may, I would advise them to exercise that power with moderation and wisdom and to examine with sympathy the hard cases that come to them. We shall help them in examining them and dealing with them. They should, if necessary, amend their laws here and there so as to deal with these hard cases. I am sure, nobody wants to do injustice or cause hardship. But the fact remains that when you change a social system or an agrarian system, the burden must fall on somebody. It is clear that you cannot always distribute your resources equally; and yet, if there is unequal distribution, the underlying social problem remains unsolved. Therefore, I would like the State Governments to look at the problem from this point of view also. I should like the representatives of the *zamindars* to look upon it from the correct point of view and not to try and profit by long litigation. They will not, I can assure them. They may gain a point here and there. The only parties to profit will be the lawyers. An hon. Member said that it was the judicial system that was responsible and not any individual member of the system. I know that; I am not blaming anybody; it is always the system that is responsible or sometimes the lack of a system.

Sir, I beg to place this report of the Select Committee before the House for a favourable consideration. I can assure the House that we shall listen to anything that is said here with respect and attention. I need hardly say that during the last two or three weeks, since we began considering this

matter, we have given an enormous amount of thought and energy to it in a concentrated way. Although it has been here only for three weeks or so, we have, perhaps, compressed the work of months into it. What we have put forward has been carefully thought out and discussed. Naturally, if we see any valid reason for changing a word or a phrase here and there, we shall only be too glad to consider it.

TO OUR SERVICES

MEN AND WOMEN OF THE SERVICES :

I am glad of this opportunity to address you. During the last three years I have met many of you, both in the Civil and Defence Services of this country. I have addressed you, discussed many matters with you and worked in close collaboration with some of you. If I had my way, I would have liked to meet many more of you so that we might know each other better; for we are workers in a common cause and much depends on the degree of our mutual understanding.

Many have praised you greatly and many have sometimes unfairly criticized you with vehemence. That was natural in the circumstances and it is possible to find, in most of us, room for praise and room for criticism. Most of you have had to adapt yourselves to a new environment and to new conditions of work within a short period of time. I want to tell you that in the three years I have known you I have found you, as a whole, loyal servants of the country. I have appreciated the way you have adapted yourselves to new conditions. Most of you have had to work much harder than before because the situation demanded hard work; you have applied yourselves to this work with goodwill and a desire to serve this country of ours, which has at last achieved its freedom.

Those of you who are in the Defence Services have had to face trials and tribulations and have stood a hard test successfully. You have thereby gained the praise of your countrymen; you have gained something even more and that is self-confidence and faith in yourselves and in your cause. Not only the men of the Defence Services but all of us, whatever the capacity we have laboured in, have stood the test of our faith and capacity during this early period of our freedom.

Just at the moment when all our Services as well as much else in the country had been split up and everything was in a state of disorganization, disaster descended upon us all, bringing not only death and suffering to innumerable human beings but also a travail of the spirit to all of us. While facing that and overcoming it, we set about rebuilding the structure that had been partly shattered. Let us not praise ourselves for what we did, for so much remains undone. But let us at least recognize our achievements, for they are not inconsiderable.

It is difficult for all of us to adapt ourselves to changing conditions; and even when we do so physically the mind lags behind. It must have been difficult for you, who are accustomed to the routine and method of a different set-up, to adapt yourselves to a new heaving and seething democracy. It is just as difficult for others to develop the discipline that freedom demands. This process must inevitably take time; yet you have succeeded in a large measure.

Every thinking person knows that the running of a modern government requires the machinery of highly organized, efficient and loyal Services. No government can function effectively without them. It was important that our Services, even though faced with new tasks and new objectives, should be loyal and efficient, breathe the new air of democracy and function in tune with the new set-up. I think the success we have had in this is satisfactory. But the ultimate test lies in the results we achieve. The only test is the advancement and well-being of the people we serve and—especially in a democracy—their goodwill. In hard times, goodwill may not be easily forthcoming. But loyal and efficient work in a great cause, even though it may not be immediately recognized, ultimately bears fruit.

You serve the nation in a variety of ways and in many capacities. Some have the responsibility of high office, others work in humbler ways; some are generals, others are ordinary soldiers in the army. In the Services, as elsewhere, discipline has to be observed and greater experience and capacity placed in a special position of authority. But whatever our rank or grade, we must always remember that we are

comrades working for the same end and respect one another as comrades should do. We live in a society which has inherited great distinctions between the high and the low, the rich and the poor. We cannot change that suddenly; we make efforts to level these differences and to see that opportunity for progress comes to all. In all our dealings we must remember our objectives and recognize the dignity of the individual and the worth of labour: Those who do not labour for the good of the community and only consume the labour of others are a burden and deserve no encouragement.

Ours is a poor country but it has tremendous resources and potentialities. We naturally want to develop these resources and get rid of the curse of poverty and unemployment. Many of our superior Services were built up in the tradition of countries that were much richer. This created a barrier between these Services and the common man. We have to break down that barrier and gradually to adopt ways more in conformity with conditions prevailing in our country. The Civil and Defence Services of a country must have proper conditions to work in assurance and security. The labourer is worthy of his hire. A service can only be efficient if its employees are contented and have an objective to work for. We have tried to provide security and see that contentment can only come from the goodwill of the people whom we serve and who are the ultimate arbiters of our destiny.

We are passing through a period of economic difficulty and it is necessary that all of us, whatever our station or degree, should share according to our capacity the burden of the day. I am glad that the Services have recognized this and in many cases have offered, of their own accord, to share the burden. There have been cuts in their salaries and compulsory saving schemes have been introduced. I know that this has hit many of them—more especially our younger officers—rather hard and that it will mean the tightening of many a belt. Yet it is right that it should be so. I am sure that every one of you would like to share this burden with others and would not care to stand apart. The very knowledge that we are doing our bit along with innumerable others

brings with it a community of feeling and a sense of satisfaction. It produces a bond among a people in a common endeavour and produces that strength in a nation before which all obstacles fade away. We work not only for today but much more for tomorrow. We build for the future. It does not matter if today brings a little hardship, provided tomorrow is going to be better for our people.

Our Services have to set an example, not only of efficient service but also of high integrity and complete freedom from communal, provincial or other bias. There are many disruptive and anti-social forces in this country and it is often said that the moral fibre of the nation is not what it was. Evil stalks the land in the shape of narrow communalism and opportunism; black-markets and the like have poisoned our trade and business to a large extent. It is for the Services to fight these evils and they can do so only if they are men and women of character, integrity and selflessness. We have to fight evil wherever we find it. We cannot afford to succumb to it or to be passive and inert spectators of it.

Many years ago I read in the writings of George Bernard Shaw something that moved me and found an answering echo in my mind and heart. He wrote: "This is the true joy in life, the being used for a purpose recognized by yourself as a mighty one; the being thoroughly worn out before you are thrown on the scrap heap; the being a force of Nature instead of a feverish selfish little clod of ailments and grievances, complaining that the world will not devote itself to making you happy."

Not many of us can rise to such heights but it sometimes happens that a whole nation, under some great leader or a mighty urge, raises itself, moulds events and makes the history of its choice. This is what happened when Mahatma Gandhi burst upon the consciousness of India and moved her people to great deeds by the magic of his personality and his message. The Father of the Nation is no longer with us but we still have his message and something of the spark that he lighted within us. The great work that he started is half finished and we have to go ahead without much rest or respite to complete it. In that historic mission we are all

comrades and, as soldiers of India, we shall march together and complete the task.

THE MODERN SYSTEM OF MEDICINE

FRIENDS, two years ago, I am reminded, I came over to attend and inaugurate another meeting of this kind. I have not the least recollection of what I said on that occasion. I am sure that on that occasion we must have uttered many plantitudes as we always do on such occasions. I have no doubt also that we meant them seriously and that most of us, if not all, tried our best to give effect to such policies and programmes as we had decided on. But the fact remains that while we make progress in various directions, somehow the over-all view is very very far from satisfactory. I am not for the moment talking about the activities of Health Ministers but of the general activities which go to promote public good. Whether it has been our fault or the fault of circumstances beyond our control, I do not know. Normally speaking, of course, we are not right or justified in blaming the stars for what are our own failings.

We are judged by results. A commander in the field of battle is judged by his victory or defeat in the field and the longest and most eloquently written report of his failure will not exonerate him. Historians may later consider on whom to lay the responsibility for the success or the failure but the fact remains that the battle has either been won or lost. Therefore, the only real test of any report you may write or I may write is victory or what we have achieved. There is also another thing to be considered which is almost as important as what we have achieved; and that is what people think we have achieved. That is important, not merely from the publicity or propaganda point of view but because

when you have to undertake vast social schemes it is highly important what people think of them.

You cannot attain success without the people's co-operation; you cannot attain success without raising the morale of the people for the task. If the people think that the country is going ahead, their morale goes up and thereby their capacity to work increases. If the people think that we are where we were or worse, their morale goes down, their desire to help goes down, their capacity to work goes down and this affects you and me and everybody else and all our work suffers. Now, of course, there are many kinds of work, very important work, which do not show immediate results and there are many kinds of research which the public are not in a position to judge. In fact, the public may even be rather amused or critical about research and yet such work is highly important and every country must carry it on so that it may yield results in the future.

Nevertheless, the important thing is that results are achieved in the present and that they are appreciated. That is to say, the results must have a social bearing. It is not much good from the public point of view if some laboratory could do something which is odd and unique. Of course, it may have some bearing on the future but generally speaking this question must be looked upon—whether it concerns health or something else—from the general point of view of the social well-being and advancement of the people as a whole. I should like to lay stress on that. As you know, more and more stress is laid on this aspect all over the world. In fact, the whole science of medicine, which some hundreds of years ago was largely concerned with what might be called individual treatment, has undergone a change of outlook. Of course, the aspect of individual treatment is still there but that is now a very minor aspect of the problem and certainly from the State's point of view it is infinitely less significant than the other important aspects, namely, general public health, sanitation, hygiene, etc. The whole conception of health and medical treatment has changed in the last few generations, and because the conception has changed, because people now look more to public health and not so

much to the private health of individuals, there has taken place a tremendous improvement not only in public but also in private health.

Now, public health is, I repeat, something that is obvious and probably somewhat trite; nevertheless, trite things must be repeated again and again. Public health depends far more on factors other than just drugs and medicines. It depends primarily, I should say, on the sufficiency of food. What is the good of your trying to treat a man who is starved or who is under-nourished? He is weak, he cannot resist disease. Public health depends next on decent living conditions, such as housing. Next to food, housing seems to be far more important—from the point of view of public health—than all the medicines in the world. This accounts for the fundamental idea of changing the environment, of providing environmental hygiene. Not only are its effects physical but they also affect the mind tremendously.

So, from the point of view of health you branch off into subjects which are not directly concerned with you at all and yet which fundamentally affect you, such as the question of food and housing. Of course, there are other things, too. You might speak of education but leave this for the present. I would like to lay stress on food and housing. We have been talking a great deal about food. In the last two months or so, to our great misfortune, we have had to face great calamities. If we had met three months ago and if I had then referred to the food situation of the whole of India, I would have struck a hopeful note. I might have said that in spite of difficulties we have turned the corner and I would have been right in saying it. It would not have been wishful thinking. And I think that the good that we have done in regard to the Grow More Food and other schemes is, in spite of a great deal of waste, a basic and substantial good which will endure and which will pay us dividends in the years to come.

And yet, today we have to face a difficult situation for a variety of reasons, the chief of them being the failure of rains in many parts of the country and tremendous floods in other parts—the failure of rains in Madras and floods in Kathiawar,

Orissa, Bihar and U.P. There has been an amazing succession of unfortunate calamities. On top of these comes the tremendous earthquake in Assam which is of a colossal character, bigger than any earthquakes we have known. We do not yet know what the exact damage is. The fact that the area affected in Upper Assam is relatively thinly populated and is not a developed area is the reason why the loss of human life and property has not been as great as it might have been in a more populated region: even so, it is heavy. And, apart from the actual damage, we have, today, to face the problem of the changing courses of rivers and of marooned people. Hills have disappeared and the whole face of Upper Assam has changed. All these ravages have been a trial for us as a nation; few catastrophes—not even a war—could have put a country on trial in this way. Therefore, we have to realize in all its fullness the extreme gravity of the situation and of not one problem but all the problems that face us. We must have a sense of urgency in dealing with them. If I may say so, I have, for the moment, lost interest in distant schemes as one has to lose in the face of grave urgency.

Let us take the housing problem which is not quite as urgent as the food problem but which is, nevertheless, of extreme importance. We were discussing it in the Planning Commission the other day and the result of that discussion was a realization of the overwhelming character of the problem. The problem, of course, was bad enough, say ten years ago—very bad, indeed. The living conditions of workers, peasants and others were bad and they grew progressively worse during the war. Then the partition came and with it came the problem of refugees and displaced persons; and all that has happened since has created a stupendous and overwhelming problem. And yet, what exactly are you going to do about it in your education and health conferences if one is condemned to live in the gutter? What is the good of your talking of health and education without housing, which is the basic thing? A man must have fair, sanitary living conditions, if not luxuries. You go to the cities like Bombay or Calcutta. It makes one despair to see the conditions in which people live there.

I have laid stress on two matters: food and housing, which I consider basic for health. These are not normally within your purview and probably your Conference will not consider them.

I just referred to the gradual change-over during the last few generations from the idea of individual treatment for diseases to the idea of public health. From the Government's point of view, this idea is very important. It is gradually spreading more and more and social systems of medicine and treatment are being adopted which are not unlike what is being done in England, for instance. In such systems, the State comes in and takes charge practically of the whole population. In the end, this is not only good in itself but probably cheaper: that is to say, cheaper not in terms of rupees, annas and pies but in terms of the general health of the nation, its productive capacity and the mental and physical well-being of the individual and the nation. The money you spend upon it is very well worth while. We must progress in this direction. All these things cost money and money is just the thing that we lack; and yet while we lack money and while that is a great drawback in the ultimate analysis, I do not think that it is money alone that comes in the way.

Money does come in the way and delays matters. But, in my opinion, it is the human factor that counts more. Even if we have all the money in the world, we obviously cannot raise our standard to the standard, say, of America in a short time. We just cannot do it all of a sudden. It takes time. And we have to take things as they are; and taking things as they are I should welcome money; but for the moment there are things which are infinitely more important than money and I go back again to the human factor, the morale of the individual and his capacity to have some objective in view which he can look forward to and work for. If you have that in the people, progress will be far more rapid than if you do not and even have all the money in the world. I want you to remember this. In the modern world, money is undoubtedly important but infinitely more important is the human factor. Money minus the human factor will not go very far but human factor minus the money will take you

some distance, though, perhaps, not very far. Therefore, we must always think of the human factor, of getting public co-operation and public understanding in the things that we do. It is, perhaps, not the expert's job. I realize that. I cannot expect each one of you to go into these things and approach the public and convert them or make them understand. It is difficult but I am merely putting to you a certain governmental point of view, because I should like public servants to approach this and other problems in this manner. Experts as you are, if you keep that viewpoint before you, I think it will help you and it will help others, too.

I find from your agenda that you are going to consider reports of the Indigenous Systems of Medicine Committee, the Homoeopathic Enquiry Committee, *etc.* I understand that our Health Minister is going to address you on this subject. I have an inkling of her views as she has expressed them to me on several occasions and she feels strongly on this subject. First of all, we have to be clear in our minds about one thing, namely, the bearing of this question on public health which the Government has to consider as being more important than the aspect of individual treatment. In so far as public health, sanitation and the prevention of diseases are concerned—I speak subject to correction—I do not know that much attention has been paid to them by the older systems of medicine. From that point of view, there is a vacuum or something near a vacuum. If you want to consider anything from the aspect of public health, you have to adopt what is called the modern method. Now, what does this word 'modern' mean? A thing that is modern is not necessarily good because it is modern; and a thing that is old is not necessarily bad because it is old. The converse is also true. A thing that is old is not necessarily good because it is old; and a thing is not necessarily bad because it is modern. Now, if you look back to the development of science and the applications of science—and the development of the science of medicine in particular—it is a very interesting history. In early days there were various theories in the domain of physics, chemistry, medicine, *etc.*, in India, in Arabia, in Europe, in Greece and in Rome. Gradually, step

by step, old theories changed as more experience was gathered and new methods were adopted. There were also new methods of understanding, of approach and ultimately of treatment, too. Each successive step that you take is built on an older experience. If you agree, then you will also agree that every achievement becomes outdated sooner or later. If you attain perfection, then, of course, there is no question of building further. I do not know if it is possible to say of any activity in human affairs that it is perfect. If a human being becomes perfect, that human being, if I may say so without disrespect, at once attains *nirvana* and is out of our sphere of activity. It is only imperfect people who function in this world. Perfection means a complete solution, a complete balance of everything and becoming part of some other sphere.

It is absurd for us to say that any system, any thought or any line of activity has attained perfection. It would be equally wrong for us to say that any system of medicine, at any time in history—including the present time—has been anywhere near perfection. What Dr Jivraj Mehta or any other eminent doctor would advise his patients to do today, he might not ten years later on account of new developments. You may strongly recommend something today; but if something new happens you will revise your opinion. That is the way of advance—having an opinion, accepting all the experience that lies behind you and adding fresh experience and knowledge to it.

I say this, because it is obvious that the old systems of medicine in India, the Ayurvedic and Unani systems, have been great systems. There is no doubt about that. In their day, they exercised considerable influence not only in our but also in far-away countries. Harun Al Rashid sent for Indian physicians to cure him. Our systems spread to Arabia and to Europe and influenced the systems of medicine there. From this very creditable record, however, it does not follow that our past system was the summum bonum; nor does it follow that you should ignore it and put it aside as worthless.

What then should our approach be? Obviously, our

approach should be one of trying to profit by past experience and integrating it with the best in other systems. One approach I would, for want of a better word, call the 'scientific approach,' the approach of a knowing mind, an experimenting mind, which is prepared to accept anything that factually or theoretically justifies itself and which goes ahead on the basis of it. When something else takes its place as an improvement, the scientific mind accepts that. In theory at least what is called modern medicine is based on the scientific approach. I am not prepared to admit that every practitioner of modern medicine has the scientific approach. I think many of them are very far from scientific in their outlook and in their work. But a scientific approach is essential in whatever domain of life you are functioning. If you do not have that approach, you lose yourself, flounder and cannot make any progress at all.

I dislike, I may tell you, calling the modern system of medicine 'Western' medicine. I think it is a wrong thing to do so, because it is as much Eastern as it is Western. It has grown out of what we have done here and what the Arabs and the Greeks have done in their countries. So, to call it 'Western' is just to give credit to others and not to take credit for something that we ourselves did. It is like people calling the modern system of numbers 'Arabic.' As a matter of fact, in Arabia they are called Indian figures. The invention of the zero and the decimal system two thousand years ago is one of the most amazing instances of the Indian genius. It is one of the greatest inventions of all time and to call it 'Western' or 'Arabic' seems to be absurd and wrong. So also to call the modern system of medicine 'Western' is completely wrong. Certainly, the West had a great share and a dominant share in its development in the recent past. But the whole thing is based on generations of experience in India, Arabia and other countries. It is this concentrated experience that is known as modern medicine.

There is no doubt at all that the Ayurvedic and the Unani systems have excellent remedies. There should be no difficulty whatever in integrating all their old and tried remedies with any other system. It is fairly easy and, in fact, many of them

have been integrated in this way. The difficulty is really more basic and fundamental. That again takes me back to the scientific approach.

I believe that an Ayurvedic physician thinks and talks in terms—you will forgive me if I am wrong—of *vayu*, *kaph* and *pith*. I am no scientist and I do not wish to go into this matter but undoubtedly that basic line of reasoning is opposed to what might be called the basic line of reasoning in modern science. Mind you, this idea of *vayu*, *kaph* and *pith* is very similar to those that prevailed in Europe. It is not a speciality of India. Maybe these ideas originated from India but this kind of approach was prevalent everywhere in the Middle Ages. From experience and by experiments, different approaches, which seemed to fit in more with the realities of the case, gradually evolved. So, we have to decide very clearly whether our approach is going to be that of *vayu*, *kaph* and *pith* or some other.

Many people in India practise some kind of medical system whether it is homoeopathy, electro-homoeopathy or whatever they may like to call it. There may be nothing against these people: they may be very good people but the trouble is that anybody can put up a board and practise medicine without any knowledge of medicine or even of that particular type of medicine. That is an extraordinary and dangerous thing which we should forbid. There must be certain standards which people must reach before they can experiment with human life.

The conclusion I arrive at is this. First of all, the modern system of medicine deals with many aspects of public and private health and surgery, which are practised by other systems, too; and we have to keep them. Secondly, the approach to any system must be on scientific lines. Our approach must be as friendly as possible, as respectful as possible but also as critical as possible. We should imbibe and accept all knowledge that we have in medicine and profit by it. As far as the basic approach is concerned, I cannot see how we can combine the two approaches, the modern treatment of disease and the older one which prevailed in the Middle Ages in Europe, in Asia and in India

and which is, to some extent, represented by Ayurveda and Unani, that is, the *vayu*, *pith* and *kaph* approach. I do not wish to come in their way but I would insist that adequate training in modern medicine should be given to every medical practitioner. I do not mind what system he practises after he has received that training. I should like both the Ayurvedic practitioner and the Unani practitioner to have this training. Let him practise his own system. But if he has the modern training and is prepared to abide by that training, he will function more or less rightly. That would apply to homoeopathy also. Indeed, where the homoeopaths and the like are concerned, by and large their training is more or less the same. So, the basic training in modern method should be common to all. For people to say that a certain system is cheaper than the other serves no purpose, for after all, the cheapest thing is to give treatment to a patient at no cost whatever.

The modern system of treatment, I believe, lays great stress not only on preventive health measures but also on more natural treatment, though drugs have no doubt become popular. But the trend is obvious. Fortunately, although I have good friends among doctors, they have not experimented on me too much—either the practitioners of modern medicine or Ayurveda or Unani hakims or Homoeopaths or anybody. And I believe that the less of medicine and drugs that one takes the better for the individual but, of course, I cannot rule it out entirely. There must be occasions when one has to take them. But there it is. We must lay greater stress on the prevention of disease and on the general raising of public standards of health than on individual treatment.

THE BUILDER OF NEW INDIA

I HAVE to convey to you, Sir, and to the House, mournful news. A little over an hour ago, at 9.37 A.M., the Deputy

Prime Minister, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, passed away in Bombay City. Three days ago, many of us saw him off at the Willingdon airfield and we hoped that his stay in Bombay would enable him to get back his health which had been so grievously shattered by hard work and continuous worry. For a day or two, he seemed to improve but early this morning he had a relapse and the story of his great life ended.

It is a great sorrow for us and for the whole country; history will record many things about him in its pages and call him the Builder and Consolidator of New India. But, perhaps, to many of us here he will be remembered as a great captain of our forces in the struggle for freedom, as one who gave us sound advice in times of trouble as well as in moments of victory, as a friend and colleague on whom one could invariably rely and as a tower of strength that revived wavering hearts. We shall remember him as a friend and a colleague and a comrade above all and I, who have sat here on this bench side by side with him for these several years, will feel rather forlorn and a certain emptiness will steal upon me when I look at this empty bench.

I can say little more on this occasion. My colleague, Mr Rajagopalachari, and I are going almost immediately to pay our last tribute and homage to him in Bombay. I understand that the President has also decided to go to Bombay immediately and the Speaker, Sir, went early this morning. I have no doubt that many of my colleagues and hon. Members of this House would also have liked to go on this occasion to pay their last tribute but I feel that he, magnificent worker that he was, would not have liked us to leave our work and just go in large numbers to Bombay at this moment. So, I have asked my colleagues to stay here all except Mr Rajagopalachari who is perhaps amongst all of us here the oldest of Sardar Patel's colleagues and comrades. And it is right that he should go and it is right that another old colleague of his, the President, should also go. For the rest, it is up to us to carry on the work here and elsewhere, for the work of the country never stops and never should stop. And so, in spite of this grievous sorrow that has come over us, we

have to steel ourselves to carry on the work in which the great man, the great friend and colleague who has passed away, played such a magnificent part.

A HALF CENTURY ENDS

IN A FEW HOURS from now, this year will pass away, the half century will also end. We stand, as it were, on the edge of the line that divides the first half of the 20th century from the second. This first half has been full of wars and tumults and vast changes, political, scientific, cultural, social and economic. We have seen great revolutions which have changed the face from what it was during the days of my early boyhood.

This half century is over. But it has brought no peace to us nor has it brought promise of future peace and, as we stand on this New Year's eve on the sword's edge of the present, darkness seems to envelop the future.

I am addressing you after a long interval and much has happened since I spoke to you last on the radio. Many calamities have fallen on us, bringing distress to our people. But the greatest of these calamities and sorrows has been the passing away from amongst us of a giant among men. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel was a dear and valued comrade in the brave days of our struggle for freedom, full of wisdom and determination, a rock of patient strength to whom instinctively all of us went for guidance. Later, when we occupied the seats of Government, inevitably some of the heaviest burdens fell on him and history will record how he discharged that duty. He will always be remembered not only as a great leader in the fight for freedom but also as a great builder, the unifier and consolidator of New India. It is a proud title to fame which he well deserved. For him it is well, for his life's duty was well performed and is over now. But for us, it is not well, for we miss strength and wisdom and we can

no longer go to him for counsel and advice. That burden which his broad shoulders carried so lightly, has now to be shared by all of us.

Tomorrow morning as the sun of the New Year rises, I shall leave Delhi on my way to the West. I shall pay a brief visit to Bangalore to open the Science Congress there and then proceed to Bombay and then to England where the Commonwealth Prime Ministers are going to meet in conference.

I am leaving India reluctantly, for I want to face our problems here and to give all my strength and energy for their solution. I do not wish to escape, even for a while, from the burden and the responsibility that fate has cast upon me. But, after full consideration, I decided to attend this conference in London. Big issues are at stake in the world today and, indeed, the fate of humanity itself is in the balance. I do not suggest that the conference in London will decide any of these issues or will finally avert the grave danger of war that confronts us. But it is possible that this conference will help in lessening the gloom somewhat and in showing a way which might lead to peace. In this grave emergency, therefore, I have thought it necessary to travel to London and to take counsel there with others who have also to shoulder heavy burdens and who are trying to see light in the prevailing darkness. If we take even a small step in the right direction, then the conference will have done well.

You know how India has laboured with all earnestness of purpose in the cause of peace. We have sometimes been misunderstood by our friends but I think it is widely realized now that the dominant urge that governs our actions is the desire to help in the maintenance of peace in this world. Everybody knows that a large-scale war today will be horrible beyond words and that its consequences will be appalling. It may even bring about the ruin of modern civilization. The small war that has been going on in Korea has already devastated that unfortunate country and brought untold misery to its people. And yet, people fight, they say, to bring freedom to the people of Korea.

Peace cannot be purchased by compromise with evil or

by surrender to it. Nor can peace be maintained by methods that themselves are the negation of peace. During our long struggle for freedom, we never surrendered and we did not compromise at any time with what we considered evil. Yet, under Gandhiji's guidance, we tried to follow the methods of peace and were friendly even to those who tried to crush us. He taught us the peaceful, yet unyielding approach; he taught us how to preserve the temper of peace even in a struggle.

Today, if we talk of peace, sometimes people mistake it for appeasement of evil. The temper of peace is completely absent today and the only alternative to a surrender appears to many people to be war with all its terrible consequences. Surely, there are other alternatives which are far removed from surrender and yet lead to the objective aimed at. It is in this spirit that we have tried to approach the world's problems. We are not pacifists. We keep an army and a navy and an air force and if danger threatens us we shall use them. But we seek no dominion over other people. Our sole object is to be left in peace ourselves to solve our own problems and, where possible, to help and co-operate with others. In doing so, we try not to be swept away by passion and anger but to maintain the temper of peaceful approach. It is in this spirit and with all humility and prayerfulness that I have endeavoured to guide India's policy. I have done so in the belief that I have the trust and goodwill of my countrymen behind me. That has fortified me and given me strength even when the outlook was dark.

In our own country there is a multitude of problems. The first of these is that of food. You know that, during the last six months, we have met with a series of natural disasters and calamities unparalleled before. Fate seems to have been most unkind to us. Perhaps, it wanted to test us to the uttermost. We will survive that test, for something of the old courage and determination is in us still and, whether danger threatens us from within or without, we shall face it calmly and unflinchingly, remembering always the great Master who led us to freedom.

We are trying to get food from all over the world,

wherever it may be available. We will make every possible effort to fight starvation and famine. If we cannot get enough food from abroad to meet all our needs, then we must spread out our food deficit all over the country and over all our people. We cannot tolerate that there should be abundance in one part and starvation in another. If we spread out this burden and all of us share it, then we may well pass the critical period of the next few months. Therefore, let us come to grips with this problem in all earnestness and determination. Let there be no waste. Let there be no selfish hoarding. Let no man shift for himself at the cost of his neighbour. It is a common peril that faces us and we can only meet it together as comrades, helping one another and thus lightening one another's distress. We have a hard time ahead. We will not escape it by running away from it or by blaming others or by futile argument.

Some people suggest that we should get rid of our commitments by putting an end to food rationing over large areas. That would be an easy way of escape for the Government but it would also be a criminal shirking of the duty and responsibility that we owe our people. We do not like rationing and controls and we should like to get rid of them as soon as possible; but at a time of great scarcity we cannot afford to see our people starve and to make excuses that we are not responsible for their starvation. The only way to meet this is by a common sharing of what we have and a common lack of what we have not.

Both the international and national situations are a challenge to us and to our manhood. How are we going to stand up to this challenge? Not by slogan and resolution, not by mutual bickering, not by feeling despondent and helpless but by putting aside our petty conflicts and differences, by pulling together and pooling our resources and facing the world as a united nation determined to overcome all obstacles that come in its way.

As Prime Minister, I am the servant of all our people and I can make no distinction. But I have another capacity also which I treasure. I am a Congressman, a member for the last thirty-eight years of a great organization which fought

a mighty empire and brought freedom to this country. During this long period of years, in common with innumerable countrymen of mine, it has been my proud privilege to work, through the Congress, for the freedom of India and the welfare of our people. With the coming of independence, a great responsibility came to all Congressmen. That responsibility was not merely to occupy the seats of authority but rather to keep the old flame alive in ourselves and in our people, to continue to serve to the best of our capacity and to remember always the lessons that our Master taught us. How have we discharged that responsibility? I fear that we cannot claim great success. But this is no time for us to criticize and find fault with one another. We have to get back to our old moorings and put an end to all disruptive and fissiparous tendencies in the Congress and in the country. That was our aim and objective several decades ago, for which we laboured throughout that period and a large measure of success came to us. Today, the same call comes to us and we must listen to it and act in accordance with it. It means that we seek no power or profit for ourselves but only endeavour to serve our people, that we seek the co-operation of all others and avoid everything that weakens and disrupts. If, remembering the inspiration of our great Master, we act on these lines, then the fears that fill our minds and the difficulties that surround us will fade away.

So, on this eve of the New Year and a new half century, I make an earnest appeal to you, men and women of India. Let us make this New Year a turning point in our national life; let us make a fresh start and light again that old flame in our hearts which warmed us when the struggle was the fiercest. Let us, above all, come together and co-operate with one another in the service of India.

Friends and comrades, I ask you for your good wishes and blessings in this new lap of life's journey that begins with the New Year in which we are all fellow-travellers marching to a common goal.

THE IMPORTANCE OF TOMORROW

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER, Sir, may I with your permission intervene and say a few words in regard to the various matters that have been discussed? My colleague, the Finance Minister, who is in charge of this particular Budget, will no doubt deal with the specific matters that have been raised in the course of this debate. I need hardly remind the House of the fact that, although this Budget is the individual responsibility of the Finance Minister, it is also the responsibility of the entire Government and, as Prime Minister, I am entirely responsible for it as well as any other member of the Government. This Budget was placed before the House after the usual consideration by the Government and the latter is completely committed to it. That does not mean that we are not willing to consider any new proposals; we certainly are, so long as the basic structure of the Budget is not affected.

My friend, the hon. Prof. Shah, pointed out various difficulties in the way of a debate here and in the way of a consideration of the Budget proposals. He pointed out how little could be done in the allotted time. I am in complete agreement with him in this matter. If there are any practical proposals which would enable us to give more time for the consideration of these problems either formally or informally, I am quite sure that the Finance Minister will gladly consider them. The real difficulty is, however, more basic and it is this: the kind of problems which the Government has to face now is so vast and intricate that it is impossible for any democratic Parliamentary Assembly to give enough time for its consideration. It is just a question of time. This is not a new difficulty. I remember that long debates on this subject took place in a country like the United Kingdom, where they found that they could not get along with what is really the 19th century procedure in this 20th century of continuous crises, social problems and international problems. So even Parliamentary procedure in the United Kingdom has gradually changed and many matters are left more to the

Committees than to the House itself. Usually, a principle is decided by the House and its working out is left to Committees. The House simply cannot find the time to consider everything. That is a difficulty inherent in the situation. If we can find a remedy for it, it will not only be good for us but, maybe, we will set an example to other democratically inclined countries who are seeking such remedies.

In spite of the fact that Parliament is in continuous session, it is not able to find time to consider in detail all the important matters that come up. We have, in fact, much less time because we are not in continuous session. I suppose our sessions will inevitably become longer and longer, so as to enable us to deal with more and more problems and have more and more discussions. Anyhow, I have stated what the difficulty is at present. Though I am in sympathy with what Prof. Shah said, I have no easy remedy for that difficulty, except to say that we are perfectly prepared to consider, together with the hon. Members of the House, any ideas or suggestions about how to give greater facilities for more intensive discussion of any great problem.

An hon. Member referred to the Budget speech as being directly or indirectly a survey of all manner of problems—domestic, international, economic, foreign, etc. The House can hardly expect the Finance Minister's Budget speech to be a survey of all these tremendous problems, although they have, no doubt, some bearing on the Budget. The world is becoming far too intricate and difficult for us to be able to keep the full picture in view always.

As I listened to the hon. Member who spoke just now, I was wondering whether we had the large picture in mind or were getting lost in a few minor and secondary matters. For instance, having referred to the Government's extravagance, the hon. Member went on to say certain things in regard to our bringing forward a Bill for giving a pension to the President. That signified to me an approach which I would call hundred per cent wrong.

Besides, I should have thought that the subject of pension for the President was hardly a matter for debate or reference

here. I say, even if this country is starving, even then you have to provide for our President. The hon. Member, Babu Ramnarayan Singh, perhaps, prefers starvation for the President and himself. I certainly will not stand in his way. But we are considering graver matters than this; and the fact that such points are raised shows that we are not looking at the grave problems on merits. We do not seem to be thinking of the vast problem that we are faced with and have to wrestle with—the vast problem of the country's economy in relation to the world's economy. This is a problem which is determined, not only by our own decisions but also, to a large extent, by happenings and events and developments in the world which are beyond our scope and control.

I propose to say a few words in regard to our general approach rather than about specific problems. I am sorry to confess that I have not been here throughout the Budget discussions. I have listened with care to some speeches when I was here and I have also taken care to read the full reports of the speeches made when I was absent. I have found a multitude of criticisms to the effect that the Government is not functioning efficiently or is not suppressing this evil or that evil, that there is frustration and so on and so forth.

With a large measure of what was said by my respected friend and colleague, Acharya Kripalani, I can quite well be in agreement. Nevertheless, I disagree with many of the conclusions he arrived at. Of course, it is possible to pick out many things in the doings of this Government with which one may not agree. Hon. Members have every right to look at the present picture of the country critically. If there was an effective Opposition in this House, undoubtedly it would be its right, indeed, its function to point out the failings of the Government and to put forward constructive proposals. Since there is no effective Opposition, I, for my part, welcome the criticism of colleagues and hon. Members who, in regard to policy, are supposed to look more or less in the same direction as we do. Criticism is useful and desirable in keeping the Government up to the mark; but one has to see the full picture, one has to balance things, one has to realize that the problems we have to face are difficult and intricate ones, for

which we cannot find any easy or magical solution. We have to compare our problems with those of other countries. We have to look for the common factor and find out how far our problems are due to our own failings and how far to world conditions. There are a hundred aspects to the problem which we have to consider. If they are to be helpful, hon. Members must look at every aspect—the good and the bad—and try to understand the basic problem that faces the country before they start to find a solution.

In the course of the last few months, the Planning Commission has been specially charged with considering these various problems, not the details of administration but rather the basic problems, including economic problems and anything that goes towards the building up of a nation's economy. The Planning Commission, with which I have the honour of being associated, has come up, in the course of its discussions, against many basic difficulties. No doubt, it will present some kind of a preliminary report to this House in the course of the next month or two. Then the House will have an opportunity of considering the problem in its various aspects. What I wish the House to consider at the moment is that the kinds of problems we have to face here are, *mutatis mutandis*, problems common to many countries in the world today. Whether you call these countries capitalist or socialist or communist, the problem is the same: the world has to face certain difficulties due to certain basic causes. I imagine there are several ways of solving them. It is not enough for this House or for this Government to dispose of the solution of the problem by saying that we shall follow the capitalist way or the way of private enterprise or the socialist or the communist way. If you say that, all that you mean is that you shall adopt a certain attitude in understanding and in trying to find a solution to that problem. That is all you mean. You do not solve the problem by passing a decree or a law to the effect that we should have socialism or nationalization or the taxation of the rich. By all means, tax anybody who can bear it; tax him as hard as you like. Certainly, let us have a socialist outlook; let us go towards the socialization of our means of production, etc. We can do that but it is not a solution; nor

is it a constructive suggestion as to how the solution can be reached. Therefore, a mere attitude is not enough. You have to do much more and find out what precisely are the steps that should be taken. That is the way the Planning Commission is trying to work and that is the way, I hope, when its report comes before it, this House will consider it.

A government is apt to go wrong, because it is overburdened with pressing problems and has little time to think in a co-ordinated and integrated way. It tries to, of course. But, generally, every department of the Government is overburdened and that again is a difficulty common to all Governments the wide world over. We are facing crisis after crisis—domestic and international—and just cannot think calmly of the future. Therefore, it is quite necessary that there should be people who are not overburdened by the problems of the day and who can think in an integrated way of the steps that should be taken. That is what the Planning Commission is for; it is working in close co-operation with the Government, thinking of these problems in this manner, offering suggestions, proposals and recommendations which the Government and the Legislature can consider and give effect to, if they so choose. Both in this House and outside, I have often been criticized for my doings and those of my Government. I think it is always good to try and discover one's failings. And, obviously, there are failings. It is quite absurd for any one to say that this Government has not made mistakes and will not make mistakes. We must be careful and introspective, we must correct our errors and welcome healthy criticism. But if you want a complete picture of what is happening, you have to see both the credit side and the debit side. You have to remember how far both these sides are governed by factors beyond our control. They are big factors that affect the whole world. If there is a world war, it may be that this Government, this House and this country are not responsible for it; it may be that we have tried to avoid it, yet we will be affected by it. We won't be able to escape the consequences of that war, even though we may try to keep out of it, as I hope we will. Similarly, there may be so many other factors that affect us and our achievements and

failures, that detract from our achievements and exaggerate our failures. The thought of these factors has often distressed me but at no time have I had a feeling of frustration. I do not personally like the word frustration to be used as often as it is. A person, who sees frustration in another, usually has it in his own mind and heart and he conveys that sense to the other person, too. When I begin to experience that feeling of sheer frustration in my work, I shall cease to have any value for this Government, because the spirit that makes one work, the vision that draws one on would cease and vanish. Then I would become a mere head and I do not think I could be of much use to this Government or to the House then.

There is another thing I should like the House to think about. Shall we not also think of our tomorrows sometimes? Or must we invariably lose ourselves in our todays? I cannot ignore today, obviously. But so far as I am concerned, I must confess to you that the morrow is slightly more important to me than today. If we are thinking in terms of progress, we have to build for a tomorrow that will make progress possible; and we have to build on a firm foundation, even though the laying of that foundation may create some difficulties today. That is the correct attitude. One may, of course, make a mistake in doing that; but that is a different matter.

There is a great deal of talk about inefficiency and corruption. I do not deny that, to a great extent, this criticism is valid; but surely, it is not a matter of policy that there is inefficiency and corruption! Every intelligent person agrees that there should be efficiency, that there should be a government that is clean from top to bottom. It is our objective to achieve such conditions where they are absent; but it is a matter of ways and means. While I admit that there is inefficiency and wastage and that there is nepotism and corruption in the country, I would like to say—and I speak from my own experience—that, in spite of all this talk, we are a more efficient and a more clean nation than most nations in the world. That, of course, is no reason why we should be happy about it: we should always strive to improve things and we should invite the co-operation of other people in doing so. We should approach this problem

in a constructive way and not merely offer destructive criticism.

Our Services are often criticized; but the Services of any large country are bound to have something of both good and bad and something of what is indifferent. It is very easy to pick out the unfavourable aspects and to criticize them.

I do not think I have been very lenient. I have not refrained from criticizing when I thought criticism was necessary. Nevertheless, I should like to say that this widespread criticism of the Services is totally uncalled for and that our Services, taken all in all, are a fine body of men and women. They have their black sheep, they have mediocre elements, they have their fools. But that is true of any large body of human beings; there are bound to be first-rate, second-rate and third-rate men. As I said, on the whole, they are an able lot of people, loyally carrying out the policies that the Government lays down. Some of them are very fine individuals, indeed. If an individual goes wrong, let us criticize him and take him to task as an individual; but let us not talk vaguely about the Services as such. All that this will do is to dishearten even the good people we have in the Services, make them less confident and, therefore, more inefficient. When Acharya Kripalani tells this House about the ineptitude of the Government and about the inefficiency, the corruption and the wastage, I agree with him in a measure. I appreciate his distress at the state of affairs in the country, because he and I and many of us here have had high ideals and when we find that we cannot reach these ideals, we are naturally distressed. Nevertheless, I would like to remind him that there is the other side of the picture also; and sometimes other people are able to see that side better than we can. I have had occasion to meet eminent people from other countries who had come to India. They have seen what we have done and what we have failed to do. I am thinking, at the moment, of those who are experts in their fields and know a great deal about the world and about what has been done in other countries today. These people have not been great admirers of India by any means, they have had no great love for India but they have, nevertheless,

been struck by the achievement of India in the last few years. They were not blind to our failings but they could also see the achievements. Many of the hon. Members must have seen the Engineering Exhibition that has been here for the last two months. It is a wonderful record of the basic things that have been done in India. It is a record that you cannot fail to recognize, whether you are an Indian or not. I was filled with a certain pride in our achievements and in what is being done. The foreign experts I was talking about also felt with some surprise that this country, in spite of the troubles it has had to face, is still achieving big things.

Take our National Laboratories. Today, they may not produce engines. But these laboratories are something that greatly impresses people from abroad. And they are impressed because of the fine work that is being done there by a thousand or more enthusiastic young scientists of India. One takes pride in them and in their work and India can build her future on that basis if they are given the chance and if we do not lose ourselves in trivialities, in the small things of life. I can mention many basic things that are being done and, I hope, will be done in the future.

The other day I was in Bombay and I visited the Aarey Milk Scheme which the Bombay Government has started. It is a magnificent project. We sometimes talk in this House about preserving cattle, about Vanaspathi ghee and other matters and, no doubt, what we say is worth while; but we always talk negatively. I know we want milk in this country; but nobody makes any constructive proposals as to how it can be obtained. To come back to the Aarey Milk Scheme, its object is to provide pure, fine milk to millions and millions of people in Bombay. Now, that is the sort of thing I should like the whole country to emulate, not only in the provision of good and cheap milk but also in the preservation of cattle. The Aarey Milk Scheme is an example of what the Government has done with the help of the country and this House. Of course, there are also other things which are in the process of being done and which will not yield immediate results. Obviously, we cannot expect our river valley schemes to give us immediate dividends. You have to wait two or three years

—perhaps ten years. Do you wish us to carry on with these schemes, even though they do not yield results at once or do you think it is more important to please the people today by lessening their immediate burdens somehow? We can do that to some extent but tomorrow the people will have no chance of further progress. In order to progress, you must save money for progress every year, whether you are a communist State or a socialist or a capitalist State; you must produce more than you can consume as a State. If you consume more than you produce, you will have bankruptcy. If you consume just enough, then you remain where you are and do not go ahead. Remember always the fact that if our production goes up a little, so does our population and you have, therefore, to reckon that too and produce more or take some measures to put a check on the growth of the population. Certainly, it is not our policy to put a premium on the increase of population of every kind of animal in this country or to allow the old and lame animals to grow in number; and we wish to do everything to prevent wild animals from spoiling our fields and eating up our crops. But some of our traditions and customs come in the way of our food production and our economy. Has any hon. Member ever calculated how much wastage there is on this score? There is an enormous wastage, because we follow certain old customs and traditions, which have no place in the modern world. In fact, they might well crush us in spite of any economy we might adopt. This is the context in which I should like to consider this Budget. I submit to this House that India undoubtedly has tremendous potential resources. India has skilful men and women to utilize these resources. We have to yoke the men and women and the natural resources together. We are trying to do so in some small measure but we have to do this more effectively. In the measure we do so, in the measure that people work hard, we produce wealth. There is no other way. A piece of legislation will not solve this problem unless we become a hard-working nation. With all respect to many people, I am compelled to say that we are not a hard-working nation. I travel abroad a good deal and often have opportunities of

seeing how other nations are facing their problems and how hard they work in Europe, China and Japan. Whether their policy is communist or socialist or some other, they work hard and suffer privations more than most of us do. I am not talking about the poor peasant or the poor worker in India but of those who are somewhat better off. I wish we could find some solution because I think it is a painful and hateful thing for people to go about feasting when there is such terrible scarcity and when there is privation and suffering all over the country.

It is now a fairly long time since I occupied this place as Prime Minister. It seems even longer than it has been, because it has been a difficult time, because there has been crisis after crisis and because all the things that one intended to do—most of them, at any rate—could not be done. Often, there were doubts; nevertheless, some part of the whole vision persisted, some faith in the people of India persisted and I tried to do my best. Whether this Government has succeeded or not is for some dispassionate historian of the future to say. Certainly, we wanted to succeed. What I am concerned with and what my colleagues, who are more or less of my age and with whom I have laboured for these thirty years or more, are concerned with is that in the afternoon of our lives, in these remaining years, we should devote all the energy that we have in realizing the ideals which we have held: we are anxious to see that we do not forsake them. Yet, it is painful to feel all the time that while you hold the ideals, something comes in the way and you cannot go forward as you want to. There are so many factors in the world that you cannot control. The human material that you work with is not always good and there are your own failings to reckon with. Nevertheless, it is something to hold them and to try one's utmost to realize them and to give all one's strength and energy in that process till one is exhausted and is thrown aside.

CO-OPERATION AMONG PEOPLE

YOU, Sir, Mr President, have referred to a multitude of problems in your address. You have commended some activities of the Government, criticized others and offered advice, so that we may function better than we have so far done. We welcome your advice and the advice of others given with good intentions and with a view to improving conditions in the country. Anything that you suggest or your organization suggests will, undoubtedly, receive our most earnest attention.

I am sure that you don't expect me to deal with the various matters you have discussed. Perhaps, it would be more suitable to the occasion if I spoke to you about certain matters of basic importance; for we have to be clear in our minds about our basic social objectives.

You will permit me to say something which I probably ought not to, and that is to confess that, during the last few years, we have not been very clear as to the direction in which we are going. In the immediate present, we might realize the importance of a particular step in the broader aspects of policy. Nevertheless, there is an enormous gulf between the immediate present and the future about which, in these changing circumstances, there is a great deal of difference of opinion in the country among those who have given thought to it.

The fact is that vast, new social forces are at work all over the world, as a result of various developments but mainly because of tremendous technological and political changes. In India and in Asia, large numbers of people have become politically conscious and refuse to submit as they did in the past. Tremendous social conflicts are taking place and they sometimes lead to international conflicts. The great nations of the world are following economic policies that differ widely from one another.

We may have a certain theoretical approach to problems but that does little good unless it is related to the practical

aspects of reality. Our approach must be fashioned by a study of existing conditions and our objectives, so that we can apply, if I may say so, the idealistic approach with a practical consideration of the problems prevailing in the country at a particular time.

You will permit me to say that it is possible that our approach is a very limited one; it is possible that our approach derives from something static that belongs to the past and not so much from the proper appreciation of a situation that is changing and dynamic. Towards the end of your address, you referred in general terms to various objectives that we have. I suppose most of us would agree with those objectives although, of course, some may go further than others.

To say that we want greater wealth, higher standards of living and greater production will, I take it, not be contradicted. We have to achieve these objectives, not merely mechanically but also in a social sense which is very important. I have been driven almost against my will to the conclusion that material well-being is just as important in human life as anything else. High standards of living are important and we must achieve them; but, at the moment it is absurd to talk of high standards in India where the lowest are sometimes lacking. We must have the basic necessities of life and only then can we think of higher standards.

Nevertheless, there is such a thing—I do not know how to define it—as the social condition of the organism or the individual or the group. Frankly speaking, when I see some of the very highly developed nations of the world, I admire them. I want to copy many of their methods and all that; and yet, a fear steals into my mind lest I should grow like them, because there is something about their methods which, I think, is not good for the individual or the group. The very things that have brought wealth and prosperity to the entire world, that is, the growth of technology, industrialization and the rest—and may I say, in passing, that I am all in favour of the industrialization of India—have also brought about the gradual and progressive turning of the human being into a machine. I think that is a very dangerous thing. We see the machine even in man's normal avocations, we see

minds that have been so mechanized that they cannot think except in the narrow grooves laid for them.

This process of mechanization is encouraged in a variety of ways. These include, to some extent, the modern methods of propaganda. So that, while you make great progress on certain planes—and that progress is necessary and desirable and must be made—you lose something which is perhaps very valuable and very precious. Nor can you retain the other things you value, the things that are precious to you, unless you have material progress. Must one pay the price of progress by losing that something or can one have both?

I personally think that most of the world's ills that are today leading us to the verge of a terrible war are, in the final analysis, due to the growth of technology in a peculiarly narrow way. In the old days, people were more backward than they are today but one had a sense of an integrated human life, a sense of balance. Today, one has a sense of complete lack of balance in the individual, the group and the nation.

There are wise men everywhere; but apart from them, we have men who are highly qualified in their special domains. If, however, they are taken out of their particular groove, they are almost completely ignorant of life and its ways and do not even know the most elementary facts of life, as, perhaps, some simple person knows them. So that, while excessive specialization and technological development do obviously lead to the larger good of humanity in many ways, a doubt creeps into my mind whether they are not undermining humanity at the same time by lowering the quality of the mind and the spirit and by engendering tendencies of self-destruction.

This is rather a distant consideration that I wish to place before you, because it leads us to think that in the world today there is a complete lack of balance. Certainly, India is not much balanced. The fault may lie with the Government or with somebody else. For the moment, let us forget whose fault it is; it may be the fault of all of us but the fact is that there is lack of balance. Our Finance Minister may seek some financial balancing about imports and exports and about

the sterling balances. That is all right; that has to be done and is wisely done; but the real lack of balance is more basic and it is affecting not only our economic life but also our political and international life.

How are we to find balance in the world and particularly in India? The equilibrium we need is not merely a question of accountancy but something deeper. We tend to think of these things from an accountant's point of view; the accountant's point of view cannot be utterly ignored, whether in business or in other undertakings; but the accountant's point of view is a narrow point of view, as far as human life is concerned. It is obvious that we cannot control the whole world. It is too big a job for us. India provides a big enough task. What can we do about it in India? I am not competent to give an answer but one thing is clear to me, namely, that whatever the answer may be, it cannot be given effect to by a governmental decree.

It is too big a problem, it is too big a job for the Government, even though the latter consists of the wisest men. Obviously, the Government must give the lead in such a matter. But in order to be effective it must have, as you yourself said, Sir, public co-operation in a very large degree.

Then I come up against another difficulty. Public co-operation in what? What is the public? What are the people? You said 'people' repeatedly. Who are the people? Are the eminent men and women who are sitting here representatives of the important elements in our national life? Are they the people you and I are thinking of? I have no doubt that there are other people equally eminent in other walks of life who have different viewpoints. Then who are the people? How are we to bring together their various viewpoints and different approaches to our problems?

Well, I suppose it is not possible to get everyone to agree. Ultimately, what will happen in this country, as in other countries, is that there will be certain cleavages of opinion representing different economic approaches. They need not necessarily come into conflict with one another all the time. People have the right to have their own approaches; but I am sure a solution can be hammered out of all these. If

people so desire, they can co-operate to a large extent, even though they differ. We seek public co-operation or the people's co-operation; but what is our purpose? And when we lay down the purpose, each group has different views about the purpose, too.

You may, of course, say in normal times that it does not matter very much if minor mistakes are made. But what one does is important in times of crisis or emergency. One has sometimes to be a little ruthless; one cannot go about knocking at every man's doorstep and asking his opinion when something has to be done the next minute or within the next hour. If one does that, there is a danger that the crisis may overwhelm us.

In times of war, a country functions in a different way from the normal. In fact, in times of war, it is even more necessary to have public co-operation than in times of peace. When urgent decisions and quick action are necessary and when people's opinions may differ considerably about the action, ironically enough that is the very time when the largest measure of support from the public is necessary. Distressing wars are going on; nevertheless, they are on a small scale; but we live in near-war conditions all over the world. Though, we hope, the war will not come to us in the near future, the conditions are such that, to some extent, we have to think in terms of war, in terms of stockpiling, for instance.

There can be no doubt that we in India, as many people in other countries, live in a period of crisis and emergency. Whether we are big enough to face them adequately or not is another matter. Yet, I find a strange lack of awareness of this fact. Even those, who criticize the Government strongly, lack urgency in their tone and in the manner of their criticism. In fact, if I may say so, an urgent thing does not take hours to tell. A crisis requires swift action and does not warrant long speeches.

It is about time that this country recognized adequately that we live in a time of deep crisis. I am not mentioning this word repeatedly to frighten you—I am not frightened of it—but to make you aware that something more than casual

talks and discussions is necessary and to tell you that the Government in any part of India may have to act swiftly and sternly because of this crisis. You must also realize that any government, if it has to function adequately, must have the support of the country. Otherwise, you may also have unstable and weak governments which, even when they are very good or wise governments, just cannot function effectively. It is very bad for a country to have weak and unstable governments in such times. It does not really matter to me what government you have—I am being quite honest—but it is obvious that only a government that can decide swiftly and act effectively will be able to control the destinies of the country in a crisis.

This crisis cannot be easily or even quickly overcome. Fortunately, in a few months' time the country will have an opportunity of choosing any government it wants to. I hope it will choose a stable government and not a weak one. Many of our problems have deeper causes than can be dealt with by accounting methods. We should study, analyse and understand them. We should try to understand, not only their deeper causes in the wide world but the psychology of our own people. All of us are too apt to advise others—and I am an equal sinner with them—and do not, in our turn, learn from others. Psychology means a good deal and, however right we may think ourselves to be, a great deal depends on how others are feeling about the course of events. If people feel that things are going wrong, then even the satisfaction that they are acting rightly is not enough.

So, we come back to the same question. How are we to evolve a policy whereby we can gain our social objectives? I should say that the only right way to do it from a governmental point of view is through what is known as the Planning Commission. I do not understand why people go on thinking of the Planning Commission as a grandiose body making wild schemes for which we may or may not have the resources.

I have said more than once that such a conception is wrong. The Planning Commission has no business to make any wild schemes at any time. It must always make schemes which can be given effect to and which are practical. We

need a planning commission to tell us how we can utilize our resources to the best possible advantage without wasting them. Indeed, if there was no planning commission in India, I would despair. Eminent men who are not troubled by daily difficulties of administration are trying to look at the whole picture impartially and discussing with members of the Government, industry, labour and so on. If these men are not good enough, we shall fail. But that is the only possible approach we can make to our problems.

It is no longer possible and no longer right for all the chambers of commerce or labour unions of the world to tell us that they will show us the direction in which we should go. The sooner we realize this the better it will be.

We have private enterprise in this country, of course, and we encourage it. We talk about the private sector and the public sector. But I think that when you come to grips with the 'subject' from a practical point of view, there is usually not too much difference of opinion between them if there is earnestness. That is important and, judging from the reports I have read and heard, the Planning Commission, in dealing with some of our problems with the representatives of industry and commerce and labour, has sometimes met with far greater success than we might have expected, simply because the people who got together were earnest about finding a way out or rather because they realized that the common interest and their personal interest lay in the same direction. When individual interests become allied with public interests, then results are achieved. Similarly, in war time, each person subordinates his private interest, to some extent, for the public good to save the country's freedom and to defend the country.

It is obvious that, in the world today, you cannot have the type of objective that, perhaps, actuated the 19th century in the West. You cannot have it anywhere. We may still be in the 19th century phase of growth in regard to industry; that is a different matter. But the social objectives have changed. We cannot create the social outlook that prevailed in the United Kingdom a hundred years ago.

Private enterprise and public enterprise are often discussed. Such discussions seem to me to be somewhat

theoretical unless we apply them to particular problems. If you look at the world today, even countries that stand hundred per cent for private enterprise are by a strange evolution changing over fairly rapidly—and not through the enactment of laws either. In almost every country of Europe, a deliberate change-over is taking place. The pace of the change-over differs from country to country.

It is not enough merely to increase production unless you know what happens to the produce. The early 19th century or the late 18th century saw the growth of modern industrialism and the rate of production increased tremendously. The people in England who produced were not men who spent their money in luxury. They lived a hard life; it was almost a religion with them to save money for development. To develop the country, they lived simple, abstemious lives; but in saving for the country they used their workers in a way which nobody can conceive of as tolerable today.

The conditions that existed in England in the early 19th century were really amazing; but they did thereby lay the foundations of a certain process of saving for the development of England. If England had to do the same today, she could not do it, because social objectives have changed and the problem of industry has to be approached in a different way.

I just mentioned controls. Obviously, nobody is going to say that controls are good in themselves and should be retained for their own sake. At the same time, I think nobody is prepared to say that there should be no controls, whatever happens. If that is the position, it is a question of examining when, where and which controls are necessary. The question of social objectives is bound to come up when the possible consequences of imposing controls or withdrawing them are considered.

For instance, it is my firm belief that one of the fatal steps that my Government took was to remove control on cloth two or three years ago. It was a dangerous step which had dangerous consequences; and I am not prepared to face those consequences again. If those consequences are repeated, the whole social structure will tumble down. Of course, controls

are hateful things; they encourage corruption and all that. I should like to do away with them; but I am not prepared to see starvation and nakedness over large parts of India for the sake of some theoretical idea that, if we did not have controls, we would gradually settle down. Of course, we would; but, gradually, most of us will be dead, too.

Therefore, I would like you to realize that any policy you may undertake, adopt or recommend, whether economic or political, cannot be judged from the kind of static viewpoint which one might have accepted some years ago. We live constantly—in every country of the world—on economic and political volcanoes. It may well be that some policy that might have been profitable or at any rate, could not have produced disastrous results some years ago, if followed now, may produce such repercussions—not, perhaps, so much in the economic field as in the social—as would shake the whole social structure which you and we all represent. I do not, of course, challenge your capacity to appreciate these various problems; but you will permit me to say that in some matters I represent expert knowledge. I may go wrong completely in the economic or political field; but I represent a certain expert knowledge of the psychology of India and her people. And I can feel, I can sense and I can see it, in spite of my having lived apart for the past four or five years. My previous contacts with the Indian masses have been so intimate that I can somehow sense what they feel, even by looking at a crowd of 50,000 or 100,000, for it has been my great good fortune to have had the affection of the Indian people.

Even when they thought that I had acted wrongly, they gave me their love and affection and there can be no more precious gift than that. It has been a very great burden on me that people should be so enormously gracious and kind to me. That I should be able to discharge my responsibilities adequately and to bring them the relief, which they desire and so richly deserve, has been my lifelong dream. And so, I try to think of these problems in my own imperfect way, try to consult my colleagues and try to find the way forward. But I am convinced that whatever that way may be, there is

no going forward very far without the largest measure of co-operation from the people.

This, ladies and gentlemen, includes you, who represent trade, industry and commerce, and those who are in other walks of life; but it principally includes the large masses of the people of this country who will ultimately make it or unmake it. I, therefore, appeal to you for intelligent co-operation. I ask no man not to criticize our Government or its doings but I do wish you and others to appreciate the crisis and the emergency that we are living in.

Humanity is passing through a crisis. If you realize this danger, you would brace yourselves up and know what to do if India were suddenly to be attacked tomorrow. I am not expecting an attack tomorrow, so don't be misled; but if India were attacked tomorrow, we would have to struggle. Would we at that time discuss secondary problems and spend time uselessly picking holes in long documents? We would try to get down to the bottom of things, come together, decide what to do with a sense of emergency and do it. It wouldn't matter very much, if somebody lost something or gained something, provided we achieved that we wanted. That is the spirit in which I would like you and the country to face our problems and that is the spirit in which I want the Planning Committee to face them and to produce something, as rapidly as possible, which can be a kind of nucleus for our actions and a basis for all classes and groups of people to come together, confer together and then to move forward jointly.

A RADIANT FIGURE

NEARLY three and a half years have gone by since Gandhiji passed away. The manner of his death was the culmination and perfect climax to an astonishing career. Even during his

life time, innumerable stories and legends had grown around him and now he seems almost a legendary figure, one in the great line of India's sages and heroes and wise men. A new generation grows up to whom he is only a name, a great name to be revered but nevertheless a name. Within a few more years there will not be many left who have come in personal contact with him and had experience of that vivid, virile and magnificent personality. The legend will grow and take many shapes, sometimes with little truth in it. Succeeding generations will remember him and pay honour to him. As is India's way, we shall add him to our pantheon and celebrate the day of his birth and the day of his passing away. We shall shout *Jai* when his name is mentioned and, perhaps, feel elated that we have done our duty to him.

What gods there are, I know not; and I am not concerned about them. But there are certain rare qualities which raise a man above the common herd and make him appear as though he were of different clay. The long story of humanity can be considered from many points of view; it is a story of the advance and growth of man and the spirit of man; it is also a story full of agony and tragedy. It is a story of masses of men and women in ferment and in movement and it is also the story of great and outstanding personalities who have given content and shape to that movement of masses.

In that story Gandhi occupies and will occupy a pre-eminent place. We are too near him to judge him correctly. Some of us came in intimate contact with him and were influenced by that dominating and very lovable personality. We miss him profoundly, for he had become a part of our own lives. With us the personal factor is so strong that it comes in the way of a correct appraisal. Others who did not know him so intimately cannot, perhaps, have a full realization of the living fire that was in this man of peace and humility. So, both these groups lack proper perspective or knowledge. Whether that perspective will come in later years when the problems and conflicts of today are matters for the historian, I do not know. But I have no doubt that in the distant as in the near future this towering personality will stand out and compel homage. It may be that the

message which he embodied will be understood and acted upon more in later years than it is today. That message was not confined to a particular country or a community. Whatever truth there was in it was a truth applicable to all countries and to humanity as a whole. He may have stressed certain aspects of it in relation to the India of his day and those particular aspects may cease to have much significance as times and conditions change. The kernel of that message was, however, not confined to time or space. And if this is so, then it will endure and grow in the understanding of man.

He brought freedom to India and in that process taught us many things which were important for us at the time. He told us to shed fear and hatred; he told us of unity and equality and brotherhood, of raising those who had been suppressed, of the dignity of labour and of the supremacy of things of the spirit. Above all, he spoke and wrote unceasingly of truth in relation to all our activities. He repeated again and again that Truth was to him God and God was Truth. Scholars may raise their eyebrows and philosophers and cynics repeat the old question: what is Truth? Few of us dare to answer it with any assurance; it may be that the answer itself is many-sided and our limited intelligence cannot grasp the whole. But, however limited the functioning of our minds or our capacity for intuition may be, each one of us must, I suppose, have some limited idea of truth as he sees it. Will he act up to it, regardless of consequences and not compromise with what he himself considers an aberration from it? Will he, even in search of the right goal, compromise with the means of attaining it? Will he subordinate means to ends?

It is easy to frame this question rather rhetorically, as if there was only one answer. But life is exceedingly complicated and the choice it offers is never simple. Perhaps, to some extent, an individual leading an isolated life may endeavour with some success to answer that question for himself. But where he is concerned not only with his own actions but with those of many others, when fate or circumstances have put him in a position where he moulds and directs others,

what is he to do? How is a leader of men to function? If he is a leader, he must lead and not merely follow the dictates of the crowd, though some modern conceptions of the functioning of democracy would lead one to think that he must bow down to the largest number. If he does so, then he is no leader and he cannot take others far along the right path of human progress. If he acts singly, according to his own lights, he cuts himself off from the very persons whom he is trying to lead. If he brings himself down to the same level of understanding as others, then he has lowered himself, been untrue to his own ideal and compromised with Truth. And once such compromises begin, there is no end to them and the path is slippery. What then is he to do? It is not enough for him to perceive truth or some aspect of it. He must succeed in making others perceive it also.

The average leader of men, especially in a democratic society, has continually to adapt himself to his environment and to choose what he considers the lesser evil. Some adaptation is inevitable. But as this process goes on, occasions arise when that adaptation imperils the basic ideal and objective. I suppose there is no clear answer to this question and each individual and each generation will have to find its own answer.

The amazing thing about Gandhi was that he adhered, in the fullest sense, to his ideals and to his conception of truth; yet, he succeeded in moulding and moving enormous masses of human beings. He was not inflexible. He was very much alive to the necessities of the moment and he adapted himself to changing circumstances. But all these adaptations were about secondary matters. In regard to the basic things, he was inflexible and firm as a rock. For him, there was no compromise with what he considered evil. He moulded a whole generation and more and raised them above themselves for the time being at least. That was a tremendous achievement.

Does that achievement endure? It brought results which will undoubtedly endure. It also brought in its train some reactions. For people, compelled by circumstances to raise themselves above their normal level, are apt to sink back to

even lower levels than before. We see something like that happening today. We saw that reaction in the tragedy of Gandhi's own assassination. What is worse is the general lowering of these standards for the raising of which Gandhi devoted his life. Perhaps, this is a temporary phase and people will recover from it and find themselves again. I have no doubt that, deep in the consciousness of India, the basic teachings of Gandhi will endure and continue to affect our national life.

No man can write a true life of Gandhi unless he is himself as big as Gandhi. So, we can expect to have no real and fully adequate life of this man. Difficult as it is to write a life of Gandhi, it becomes far more so because his life has been an intimate part of India's life for half a century or more. Yet, if many attempt to write his life, they may succeed in throwing light on some aspects of this unique career and also give people some understanding of this memorable period of India's history.

Tendulkar has laboured for many years over this book. He told me about it during Gandhiji's life time and I remember his consulting Gandhiji a few months before his death. Any one can see that this work has involved great and devoted labour for many long years. It brings together more facts and data about Gandhi than any book that I know. It is immaterial whether or not we agree with the author's interpretation or opinion. We are given here a mass of evidence and we can form our own opinions. Therefore, I consider this book to be of great value as a record not only of the life of a man supreme in his generation but also of a period of India's history which has intrinsic importance of its own. We live today in a world torn with hatred and violence and fear and passion and the shadow of war hangs heavily over us. Gandhi told us to cast away our fear and passion and to keep away from hatred and violence. His voice may not be heard by many in the tumult and shouting of today but it will have to be heard and understood some time or other if this world is to survive in any civilized form.

People will write the life of Gandhi and they will discuss and criticize him and his theories and activities. But to some

of us, he will remain something apart from theory—a radiant and beloved figure who ennobled and gave significance to our petty lives and whose passing has left us with a feeling of emptiness and loneliness. Many pictures rise in my mind of this man, whose eyes were often full of laughter and yet were pools of infinite sadness. But the picture that is dominant and most significant is as I saw him marching, staff in hand, to Dandi on the Salt March in 1930. Here was the pilgrim on his quest of truth, quiet, peaceful, determined and fearless, who would continue that quiet pilgrimage, regardless of consequences.

THE TRIBAL FOLK

M^R CHAIRMAN and friends, this audience is more or less a select one since it consists largely of experts. I am not an expert and, I am afraid, I shall not be able to contribute much if we were to sit down and discuss your problems.

I suppose you have invited me here, because I happen to occupy the office of Prime Minister but I think I have another and possibly greater claim to participate in this Conference. The claim is that I have always—long before I became Prime Minister—felt very strongly attracted to the tribal people of this country. This feeling was not the curiosity an idle observer has for strange customs; nor was it the attraction of the charitably disposed who want to do good to other people. I was attracted to them simply because I felt happy and at home with them. I liked them without any desire to do them good or to have good done to me. To do good to others is, I think, a very laudable desire but it often leads to great excesses which do not result in good to either the doer or the recipient.

In the tribal people, I have found many qualities which I miss in the people of the plains, cities and other parts of

India. It was these very qualities that attracted me.

The tribal people of India are a virile people who naturally went astray sometimes. They quarrelled and occasionally cut off one another's heads. These were deplorable occurrences and should have been checked. Even so, it struck me that some of their practices were perhaps less evil than those that prevail in our cities. It is often better to cut off a hand or a head than to crush and trample on a heart. Perhaps, I also felt happy with these simple folk, because the nomad in me found congenial soil in their company. I approached them in a spirit of comradeship and not like some one aloof who had come to look at them, examine them, weigh them, measure them and report about them or to try and make them conform to another way of life.

I am alarmed when I see—not only in this country but in other great countries, too—how anxious people are to shape others according to their own image or likeness and to impose on them their particular way of living. We are welcome to our way of living but why impose it on others? This applies equally to national and international fields. In fact, there would be more peace in the world, if people were to desist from imposing their way of living on other people and countries.

I am not at all sure which is the better way of living. In some respects I am quite certain theirs is better. Therefore, it is grossly presumptuous on our part to approach them with an air of superiority or to tell them what to do or not to do. There is no point in trying to make of them a second rate copy of ourselves.

Now, who are these tribal folk? A way of describing them is that they are the people of the frontiers or those who live away from the interior of this country. Just as the hills breed a somewhat different type of people from those who inhabit the plains, so also the frontier breeds a different type of people from those who live away from the frontier. My own predilection is for the mountains rather than for the plains, for the hill folk rather than the plains people. So also I prefer the frontier, not only in a physical sense but because the idea of living near a frontier appeals to me intellectually.

I feel that it would prevent one from becoming complacent and complacency is a very grave danger, especially in a great country like India where the nearest frontier may be a thousand miles away.

We should have a receptive attitude to the tribal people. There is a great deal we can learn from them, particularly in the frontier areas; and having learnt, we must try to help and co-operate. They are an extremely disciplined people, often a great deal more democratic than most others in India. Even though they have no constitution, they are able to function democratically and carry out the decisions made by their elders or representatives. Above all, they are a people who sing and dance and try to enjoy life; not people who sit in stock exchanges, shout at one another and think themselves civilized.

I would prefer being a nomad in the hills to being a member of stock exchanges, where one is made to sit and listen to noises that are ugly to a degree. Is that the civilization we want the tribal people to have? I hope not. I am quite sure that the tribal folk, with their civilization of song and dance, will last till long after stock exchanges have ceased to exist.

It is a very great pity that we in the cities have drifted so far away from the aesthetic side of life. We still have a good many folk songs and dances when we go to the villages, because modern civilization has more or less left them untouched. The progress of modern civilization in India involves both good things and bad. One of the things we have lost is the spirit of song and dance and the capacity for enjoyment and this is what the tribal people so abundantly have. We seem to pay too much attention to the cinema; it is undoubtedly an excellent medium for many good things but unfortunately it has not proved to be particularly inspiring. We must imbibe something of the spirit of the tribal folk instead of damping it with our long faces and black gowns.

For half a century or more, we have struggled for freedom and ultimately achieved it. That struggle, apart from anything else, was a great liberating force. It raised us above ourselves, it improved us and hid for the moment some of our

weaknesses. We must remember that this experience of hundreds of millions of Indian people was not shared by the tribal folk. Our struggle for freedom did influence the tribes in Central India to some extent but the frontier areas of Assam, for instance, remained almost unaffected by it. This was partly due to the inadequacy of the means of communication available to us in the old days. Of course, there were other reasons, too.

One of the reasons was that the city people were a little afraid to leave their familiar haunts and go into the mountains. The Christian missionaries went to various tribal areas and some of them spent practically all their lives there. I do not find many instances of people from the plains going to the tribal areas to settle down. Apart from our own lack of initiative, we were not allowed to go there by the British authorities then in power. That is why our freedom movement reached these people only in the shape of occasional rumours. Sometimes they reacted rightly and sometimes wrongly but that is beside the point. The essence of our struggle for freedom was the unleashing of a liberating force in India. This force did not even affect the frontier people in one of the most important tribal areas. The result is that while we have had several decades in which to prepare ourselves psychologically for basic changes, the tribal people have had no such opportunity. On the contrary, they were prepared the other way round through the efforts of the British officials and sometimes the missionaries. The missionaries did very good work there and I am all praise for them but, politically speaking, they did not particularly like the changes in India. In fact, just when a new political awareness dawned on India, there was a movement in north-eastern India to encourage the people of the north-east to form separate and independent States. Many foreigners resident in the area supported this movement. I do not understand how it could be considered practical or feasible from any point of view. My point is that the whole of the north-east frontier had been conditioned differently during the past generation and even in more recent years. The fault lay partly with us and partly with circumstances. These

factors have an important bearing on any genuine understanding of the tribal folk. They are our own people and our work does not end with the opening of so many schools and so many dispensaries and hospitals. Of course, we want schools and hospitals and dispensaries and roads and all that but to stop there is rather a dead way of looking at things. What we ought to do is to develop a sense of oneness with these people, a sense of unity and understanding. That involves a psychological approach.

You may talk day after day about development programmes in regard to schools and other matters but you will fail completely if you do not touch the real core of the problem. The need today is to understand these people, make them understand us and thus create a bond of affection and understanding. After the achievement of independence, the basic problem of India, taken as a whole, is one of integration and consolidation. Political integration is now complete but that is not enough. We must bring about changes much more basic and intimate than mere political integration. That will take time, because it is not merely a matter of law. All we can do is to nurture it and create conditions where it finds congenial soil. So, the greatest problem of India today is not so much political as psychological integration and consolidation. India must build up for herself a unity which will do away with provincialism, communalism and the various other 'isms' which disrupt and separate.

As I said, we must approach the tribal people with affection and friendliness and come to them as a liberating force. We must let them feel that we come to give and not to take something away from them. That is the kind of psychological integration India needs. If, on the other hand, they feel you have come to impose yourselves upon them or that we go to them in order to try and change their methods of living, to take away their land and to encourage our businessmen to exploit them, then the fault is ours, for it only means that our approach to the tribal people is wholly wrong. The less we hear of this type of integration and consolidation of the tribal areas, the better it will be.

We ought to be careful about appointing officers any-

where but we must be doubly so when we appoint them in tribal areas. An officer in the tribal areas should not merely be a man who has passed an examination or gained some experience of routine work. He must be a man with enthusiasm, whose mind and even more so whose heart understand the problem it is his duty to deal with. He must not go there just to sit in an office for a few hours a day and for the rest curse his fate for being sent to an out of the way place. That type of man is completely useless. It is far better to send a totally uneducated man who has passed no examination, so long as he goes to these people with friendship and affection and lives as one of them. Such a man will produce better results than the brilliant intellectual who has no human understanding of the problem. The man who goes there as an officer must be prepared to share his life with the tribal folk. He must be prepared to enter their huts, talk to them, eat and smoke with them, live their lives and not consider himself superior or apart. Then only can he gain their confidence and respect and thus be in a position to advise them.

The language problem is almost always exceedingly important from the psychological point of view. The best of solutions can come to nought if misunderstood or misinterpreted by the party concerned. It is absolutely clear to me that the Government must encourage the tribal languages. It is not enough simply to allow them to prevail. They must be given all possible support and the conditions in which they can flourish must be safeguarded. We must go out of our way to achieve this. In the Soviet Republic we have the example of a country that has adopted such a policy with success. Lenin and other leaders in his time were exceedingly wise in this respect. Regardless of their ultimate objective, they wanted to win the goodwill of the people and they won it largely by their policy of encouraging their languages, by going out of their way to help hundreds of dialects, by preparing dictionaries and vocabularies and sometimes even by evolving new scripts where there were none. They wanted their people to feel that they were free to live their own lives and they succeeded in producing that impression. In the

matter of languages there must be no compulsion whatever. I have no doubt at all that the West Bengal Government must have built special schools in places like Darjeeling and Kalimpong for the Tibetan-speaking people. If the tribal people have a script we must, of course, use it. But, normally, they do not have a script and the only script they have thus far learnt to some extent is the Roman script. It is a good script no doubt; and because many people have learnt it, I would not discourage it. But if we are to evolve a script—here I do not speak with any assurance but am merely saying something that has occurred to me—it might be better, for the future, if we were to use the Devanagari script. It is a relatively easy script, apart from the fact that it can put the tribal folk more in touch with the rest of India than any other script. In areas where a majority of the people already know the Roman script, I would not suddenly force them to abandon it because I do not want them to feel compelled in any way.

I find that so far we have approached the tribal people in one of two ways. One might be called the anthropological approach in which we treat them as museum specimens to be observed and written about. To treat them as specimens for anthropological examination and analysis—except in the sense that everybody is more or less an anthropological specimen—is to insult them. We do not conceive of them as living human beings with whom it is possible to work and play. The other approach is one of ignoring the fact that they are something different requiring special treatment and of attempting forcibly to absorb them into the normal pattern of social life. The way of forcible assimilation or of assimilation through the operation of normal factors would be equally wrong. In fact, I have no doubt that, if normal factors were allowed to operate, unscrupulous people from outside would take possession of tribal lands. They would take possession of the forests and interfere with the life of the tribal people. We must give them a measure of protection in their areas so that no outsider can take possession of their lands or forests or interfere with them in any way except with their consent and goodwill. The first priority in tribal areas, as well as

elsewhere in the country, must be given to roads and communications. Without that, nothing we may do will be effective. Obviously, there is need for schools, for health relief, for cottage industries and so on. One must always remember, however, that we do not mean to interfere with their way of life but want to help them live it.

THE PREVENTIVE DETENTION BILL

WE HAVE LISTENED to a large number of speakers during this debate. Many of them were eloquent, others narrated individual experiences, some were even autobiographical. They enunciated democratic principles and were at pains to point out how this Bill violates all of them. Listening to this debate, I have had a growing feeling of unreality, as though we were not discussing any particular Bill before this House but rather our personal experiences, our hopes for the future, so much so that we seem altogether to have ignored the Bill, its content and its language. We have discussed democracy at length and I myself claim to have some feeling for it. Democracy, as I understand it, means something more than a certain form of government and a body of egalitarian laws. It is essentially a scheme of values and moral standards in life. Whether you are democratic or not depends on how you act and think as an individual or as a group. There is a fundamental approach to political and other problems which may be called democratic and there are others which are not. Let us examine this Bill in the light of this criterion. If we find that there is anything basically wrong with the Bill, let us scrap it by all means.

My colleagues in the Cabinet and I have given the most earnest consideration to this measure because, either apparently or really, it seeks to limit in a measure the normal freedom of the citizen. It is only right that this House should

accord its assent to it only after it has examined its contents with the greatest vigilance. We, in the Cabinet, eventually decided that this measure was not only desirable but necessary at the present moment in India; we, therefore, decided to continue the old measure with certain important and basic changes. The question then arose as to how far we should depart from the provisions of the old measure and how we could ensure that this Act would not be misused. Hon. Members have pointed out several instances where, they felt, that the law had been misused. I do not know of these individual cases and it is likely that there may have been some illegitimate use of the law.

While discussing this measure, one should always bear in mind the particular circumstances which this measure is intended to correct. I shall leave the question of the misuse of the law open and am willing hypothetically to grant that it has, in certain cases, gravely offended against individual liberty. An hon. Member desired to discuss the provisions of the Bill in relation to Hyderabad. In Telengana we had to contend against conditions approximating to a civil war; the authority of the State was challenged by certain disruptive elements in society. I use the words 'civil war' advisedly because arms were used by both the sides and those who had used arms against the State have refused, to this day, to lay down their arms, even if these are not being used any more to undermine authority. The situation that confronts the Government is, you will agree, extraordinary. If the situation in Telengana has now improved considerably, it is the Government, which I have the honour to represent, that is to be given credit for it. This change has certainly not been an automatic process. It was made possible only by a certain policy pursued by my Government, year after year, under circumstances of great stress. Even so, the fact remains that some people, who are known to possess arms, can dictate the terms on which they would lay down their arms. It is amazing that some hon. Members who hold forth on democratic principles and the freedom of speech in this House should themselves possess arms. If they refuse to lay down their arms, I am convinced that it is only because they hope to use them

in the future. I am, however, aware that certain hon. Members have recently changed their policy in this matter and I am glad of this change and welcome it.

Hon. Members have examined the Bill mostly in rather academic terms, in terms of the 19th century concept of British democracy. We are in the middle of the 20th century and I doubt if these concepts can apply in vacuo to any given situation in India. My Government and I fully accept and endorse democratic values and standards but one should avoid thinking merely in terms of phrases and clichés, forgetting in the process the principles which they represent. I wonder how many among the Members of the Opposition or even among my colleagues accept the so-called basic values of democracy. How many countries are there in Europe, or in Asia for that matter, that venerate these values? I do not deny that there are a few outstanding exceptions. My own feeling is that the whole system of democracy is coming up against several inherent difficulties. Perhaps, my honourable friends opposite—some of them at any rate—will term these 'inner contradictions'. Perhaps, they really are so.

The House knows as well as I do that any government that brings forward a Bill of this kind can become unpopular. Therefore, it takes my Government a great deal of courage to introduce such a Bill. In fact, such legislation can be undertaken only by a government which feels its responsibility very keenly and does not wish to escape from it. If, because of this measure, the people of India do not want us, well, they can throw us out. It is all very well for certain hon. Members to defy us to face another general election. Surely, it was not very long ago that we contested the elections. The old Detention Act was very severe and we are now seeking to amend it. During the elections, this particular amendment was discussed and criticized a great deal by Members of the Opposition. Being the party then in power, we had implicitly to justify the measure. Yet, the results of the elections are there for all to see.

Some hon. Members talk glibly about a police State. I put it to them that they think over the matter calmly and

find out if there is the remotest justification for using that word. I invite them to compare the structure of our Government with that of many others. I do not like criticizing any other country nor does it become me to do so. I do not know what their problems are. It may be that the way they have chosen is right for their country; I shall not judge for them just as we will not let another country judge for us or let them impose their ideas upon us. But when I am criticized, I can, however, look round and invite you to compare the Governments in Asia and Europe. Let us, for instance, compare our Government with authoritarian regimes. Can the hon. Members still maintain that this measure is unduly restrictive in the modern context? May I repeat that I do not seek to judge but merely to compare? Surely, a country which has elected the hon. Members opposite to represent some of its constituencies could not possibly be a police State.

Some hon. Members seemed to imply that this Bill was directed against a certain group or party. That, I think, is a wrong view to take of the Bill. We have had in India, broadly speaking, four types of what I call anti-social activities. There has been a great deal of activity with communal purposes. I am only referring to the activities accompanied by violence and not merely to expressions of subversive views. Then there is the communist activity—and when I say communist I am not referring only to the activities of the Communist Party of India as such. It is a loose word which I have used to describe the many groups and parties that are distinct from one another and I do not know all their names. They breeze in and out of the scenes of trouble. They recognize no discipline, not even the discipline of their own party. Thirdly, we have also witnessed various forms of terrorist activity by *jagirdars* in our country. Broadly speaking again, I shall refer to these as *jagirdari* activities.

The other day, an hon. Member opposite, referring to the disturbances in Calcutta, claimed that it was 'the sweep of history' which had forced the masses into action. Broad masses have been in action before and have brought about big changes, for good or for bad. But to see in these incidents in Calcutta or elsewhere the influence of the 'broad masses

in action' seems to me not only to be a complete misjudgment of what is happening but also a complete misuse of words. Let us consider the incidents in Calcutta to which my honourable friends referred. Those who were responsible for these incidents justified the use of violence by arguing that certain assurances given by the Government of India and the Government of West Bengal in regard to food supplies in the State had not been fulfilled. The question of fulfilling the promise did not arise until six months later. When these incidents took place, the Governments of India and West Bengal had done all that they had undertaken to do until that day. Calcutta had plenty of wheat, not only wheat but also rice. Certain people in Calcutta, however, announced their intention to hold demonstrations on the ground that the Government of India had not fulfilled its programme. The leaders concerned were sent for by the Chief Minister of West Bengal. He gave them the facts and the figures and convinced them that there had been no breach of promise. They left satisfied that there was no ground for complaint against either of the Governments. Yet, amazingly enough, they all returned in a procession the next day and there was this trouble. In a city like Calcutta, as hon. Members can well imagine, it is very easy for a crowd of two to five hundred persons to create trouble if they are so inclined. It is to this small, unruly crowd that the hon. Member referred as 'the broad masses in action'. Speaking of Calcutta, another incident comes to my mind; this took place two or three years ago. Calcutta was then faced with grave and unprecedented problems because of the large influx of displaced persons from East Bengal. A state of semi-terror prevailed in the city and bombs were thrown at policemen, shops and tram-cars. It was at about this time that I went to Calcutta and addressed these 'broad masses'. A million of them came to my meeting and at that meeting a bomb was thrown, resulting in the killing of a police inspector and two or three others; the man who threw the bomb was himself wounded. Anticipating some disturbance of this kind, I had requested them at the outset that, even in the event of a murder in their midst, they should remain calm and disciplined. And

they did behave with discipline. As I was still speaking, the 'broad masses' wanted to deal with the bomb-thrower and restore order. They were clearly not willing to be imposed upon by the terrorists and some of them said so. Eventually, order was restored. The 'broad masses' went into action against the trouble-makers. This seems to me to be more plausible instance of the 'broad masses in action'.

Life in the big cities like Calcutta, Delhi or Bombay would become impossible, if small crowds of a few hundred people were to dislocate the normal life of millions in this manner. Here, in Delhi, disturbances broke out the other day as a protest against a proposed marriage, which was entirely a private affair; whether it was right or wrong was nobody's concern. Yet, this was the signal for anti-social elements in the city to start breaking the windows of the court-house, hitting people in Chandni Chowk and generally creating trouble. If the Delhi police had not acted as they did, the trouble would have spread to other parts of the city. I shall never forget the gruesome incidents, in Delhi and all over the Punjab between August and October in 1947. People who are normally law-abiding were incited to participate in acts of barbarity. If, in the name of democracy, you want people to be incited to do wrong and the structure of a democratic State we have built up undermined, you are welcome to it. Only it is not my conception of democracy.

We have to bear in mind the conditions in India, as they are today, which this Bill seeks to correct. It is admittedly our duty to protect the liberty of the individual, to see that it is not gravely offended against. I reaffirm my desire to secure the necessary safeguards. Remember that we have, at the same time, to bear in mind the interests of the community and the country as well. Unless the State is perfect and every individual is perfect, there is always some conflict between the freedom of the individual and the security of the State. In extreme cases, the State in some countries is put above everything else, above the freedom of the individuals of which it is composed and the State thus becomes deified. This has been done in some great countries but it is not for me to criticize them. For my part I cherish the freedom of the

individual and I do not want that freedom to be restricted in the name of the State but if the safety of the State is at stake the freedom of certain individuals has to be curbed. After all, in times of war, every democratic country has to limit the freedom of the individual because the State is in danger. I do not mean to say that we in India are now living through times of war. In fact, many hon. Members of the Opposition have remarked on the relatively stable conditions, political and economic, that now obtain in this country. Probably, if they had been speaking in another context, they might not have so readily granted the fact that we have progressed. In fact, before now, they blamed us for lack of progress. In this particular case, it suits them to hand us a few bouquets for maintaining stability and security in the country.

To return to the subject, the essential question remains as to where the line should be drawn between the interests of the State and those of the individual; this will admittedly vary with the circumstances. In times of war the demarcation should be in favour of the State and in peace it should be to the advantage of the individual without, of course, endangering the interests of the State, for the State can at no time be ignored. Hon. Members opposite have referred to the practice in the U.K. in this matter, perhaps rightly so, because truly enough we have fashioned our Parliament after the British Parliament; even our laws are largely similar. I must, however, point out that there is a vital difference between our country and that compact little island with centuries-old traditions of disciplined behaviour by the citizens and above all the Rule of Law. I admire her people for it; but only a few years have elapsed since our country emerged from servitude. I believe that we have gone forward in spite of the various obstacles that have impeded our progress. More than anything else, we have held together as a people and all the efforts of this House and our Government should continue to be directed towards the maintenance and promotion of social cohesion. There are fissiparous forces at work in our country, such as the demand for linguistic provinces, for instance, that make for disunity and tend to

pull apart our integrated structure. We have to guard against such forces, for they can overwhelm a country. In the context of this danger, a measure like this, we feel, is essential.

Some hon. Members pointed out that the Bill had not undergone many changes as it passed through the Select Committee. While it is true that not very many changes were made, important changes were effected. This is so, because before the Bill was referred to the Select Committee many informal Committees had discussed it in all its aspects. Having passed through so many sieves, it was the product of our concentrated effort. The scope for changes by the Select Committee was thus limited.

In this debate, a great deal of stress has been laid on the function of lawyers and the availability of legal advice. My reputation in that large and very estimable community of lawyers in India is not the best possible because, estimable as they are, I am afraid I do not admire their profession. It is not their fault, of course. The defect really lies with the judicial structure that we have inherited from the British which entails inordinate delay and expense. However efficacious this system may be, it really proves to be unjust in the end because of the excessive delay and expense it involves.

If the House would like to have a full-fledged trial in each case, let it have one by all means. Here you have three eminent people, Judges of the High Court and the like. The House knows very well that the Judges of the High Court and of the Supreme Court are independent of executive authority. In fact, they have often been outspokenly critical of executive authority. These judges cannot be partial to the executive. If the matter is left in their hands and they have the opportunity to meet the accused, talk to him and elicit the necessary information from him, they are likely to take a lenient view of his offence. If, on the other hand, you convert it into a semi-trial, the judge does not feel the same sympathy or responsibility for the accused because the latter has a counsel to represent him. If you have lawyers on the one side, you have to have lawyers on the other. Then, the whole purpose of this measure is defeated. Of course, we must give the

detenu all the facilities necessary for him to defend himself.

The House will remember that even during the last general election men were killed in Rajasthan and Saurashtra by the *jagirdari* elements there, so that these people might not vote for the Congress. It was openly proclaimed in posters—they did not believe in hints—that any one who voted for the Congress would be killed. If an enquiry on the Saurashtra affairs was conducted in an open court where the *jagirdars* and princes were present, can you imagine what the fate of that unhappy wretch who gave evidence against the *jagirdar* or the prince would be? If you insist on bringing in witnesses and eliciting their evidence under conditions like these, such evidence may not be forthcoming. Or alternatively, you will have to undertake elaborate measures to protect individual witnesses and, in effect, you will have to detain practically every witness. I feel this would be impracticable. I would, therefore, beg the House to forget the past, for a moment. Consider the Bill as it stands with its various safeguards.

Much has been said against the district magistrate and the police. I am not here as an apologist for them. But I do submit to this House that it is not right and not fair to run down our Services en bloc like this. There are good, bad and indifferent people everywhere. But this method of running down people, who have to shoulder heavy responsibilities and have often to face crises, is not fair because they never get a chance to defend themselves in public. They make mistakes; they, nevertheless, try to function according to their judgment and discretion.

Something has been said about the State Governments, too. Our State Governments have to shoulder direct and immediate responsibilities while the Government of India, sitting in New Delhi, does not have to do so. They deal with the problems of their people daily as they arise. While I am about it, I should like to pay a tribute to our State Governments for the way they have discharged their responsibilities during these five years. I say this especially because I understand an hon. Member spoke harsh words about the Government of Saurashtra. In fact, this is one of the most efficient and able Governments in India. In the particular

case referred to by the hon. Member, the Saurashtra Government was very reluctant to take action and I had repeatedly to write to the Chief Minister and press him to act before the situation deteriorated further. And the hon. Member tells me that the Chief Minister goes about arresting people and behaving like a Chengiz Khan or a Tamerlane. I do not know how many hon. Members know the Chief Minister of Saurashtra. I know him to be one of the humblest and ablest of men in our country.

It is the State Governments and our Services who have actually to deal with difficult situations like these. If they make mistakes, let us make a law to prevent such mistakes. A district magistrate, almost in all cases except in a grave emergency, has to consult the Home Minister concerned. If he does not refer the matter to the Home Minister because he has to act quickly, you can always provide in the law that the Home Minister be consulted within a period, say, of twelve days. The responsibility then becomes that of the State Government. You can also provide for a reference of the case to be made to the Advisory Council which can be assisted by eminent judges or persons with some experience of the judiciary. You can also provide for the Government of India to be informed of the action taken. You may vary the provisions, add to them and change them if you want to. But I submit that there are enough safeguards to prevent injustice being done. After all, I cannot guarantee that injustice will never be done. In any case, the hon. Members of this House can always draw the attention of the wide world to the injustice, as they have done in the past. I shall certainly welcome it if they do. The Members of the State Legislatures can do likewise.

If you look at the Bill carefully, it is exceedingly unlikely that any miscarriage of justice can occur. Even if any injustice were done, it could not endure for long. I, therefore, submit that, subject to such minor amendments and variations as in the judgment and wisdom of the House are to be accepted, the main approach of this Bill is not only right but is wholly democratic.

INDEX

A

Aarey Milk Scheme, 559
 Abdullah, Sheikh, 102, 103, 111, 112, 191
 Accession, 121, 122, 294
 Acheson, Mr, 249
 Acquisition of Properties, 472
 Afghanistan, 46, 225
 Africa, 199, 217, 227, 276, 283, 299, 318, 345
 Agreement of April 8, 165, 170-172
 Agriculture, 84, 94, 199, 331
 Agricultural Development Committee, 61
 Agricultural Loans Agreement, 58
 Ahmedabad, 279
 Ajmer, 58
 Akbar, 433
 All India Congress Committee, 279
 All India Radio, 92, 277, 532, 547
 All India Newspaper Editors Conference, 462
 Allahabad, 504
 Allahabad High Court, 509
 Always, 32
 Ambedkar, Dr, 500, 502
 America, 32, 46, 48, 63, 69, 71, 196, 197, 203, 211, 267, 271, 305, 314, 324, 347, 386, 396, 397, 415, 416, 420, 421, 444, 445
 American Capitalism, 48
 American Constitution, 113
 American Life, 416
 Americans, 203, 212, 213, 383, 496
 Andhra, 35-36, 37, 41
 Anglo-American Bloc, 310, 311, 314, 315, 323, 344
 Arabia, 358, 541
 Architecture, Indian, 432
 Armaments, 118
 Art, Indian, 387
 Art Galleries, 388
 Aryans, 73
 Asia, 5, 42, 49, 198, 199, 209, 214 to 217, 223, 224, 226, 227, 238 to 240, 242, 251, 269, 275, 276, 280, 282, 283, 299, 318, 325, 345, 356, 373, 383, 384, 396, 397, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 424, 425, 444, 445, 446, 478, 482, 495, 544

Asoka, 433
 Asoka Chakra, 28
 Assam, 9, 31, 64, 150, 184, 185, 233, 448, 539
 Atom Bomb, 218, 221, 254, 309, 371, 412
 Atomic Energy Commission, 366, 367
 Attlee, Mr, 260, 264
 Ayurvedic System of Medicine, 542, 543
 Ayyangar, Mr Gopalaswami, 113, 172, 176

B

Backward Classes, 487
 Backward Classes League, 56
 Bagerhat, 138
 Baldwin, Mr Stanley, 455
 Bangalore, 366, 548
 Banking, 88
 Basic Education, 68
 Bengal, 37, 38, 58, 136, 142, 143, 146, 150, 151, 152, 159, 165, 166, 168, 169, 184, 185, 232, 334, 408, 450
 Bengal Famine, 330
 Bhabha, Dr, 367
 Bharat Mata, 63
 Bhatnagar, Dr, 367
 Bihar, 38, 539
 Bihar High Court, 504, 508
 Bismarck, 282, 283
 Board of Scientific and Industrial Research, 366
 Bombay, 40, 233, 330, 539, 546, 559, 588
 Boundary Commission, 35
 British, 20, 21, 31, 34, 107, 125, 128, 204, 207, 215, 222, 256, 307, 312, 314-316, 352, 396, 413, 441, 442, 490, 501, 523, 579, 589
 Buddha, 93, 390
 Burma, 37, 46, 224, 269, 276, 282, 396

C

Cairo, 254
 Calcutta, 135 to 138, 140, 141, 142, 167, 234, 586, 588

C—(Contd.)

Cambridge, 202
 Canada, 214, 215, 217, 219, 436
 Canal Waters, Indo-Pakistan, 177,
 180, 192, 231, 452
 Capital, 476, 477
 Capitalism, 46, 47, 48
 Capitalism, American, 48
 Central Asia, 106, 416
 Central Europe, 315
 Central India, 579
 Central Museum of Asian Antiqui-
 ties, 388
 Central Partition Committee, 180
 Centralization, 72, 420
 Ceylon, 228, 276, 305, 313, 396, 421,
 426, 428, 429
 Charklia, 97
 Chenab, 192
 Children, 376, 435
 China, 24, 25, 27, 39, 226, 240, 249,
 250, 251, 253, 255, 257, 258, 260,
 261, 266, 271, 272, 276, 277, 280,
 281, 284, 324, 326, 327, 328, 311,
 346, 347, 384, 503
 Chinese Suzerainty over Tibet, 271,
 272
 Chittagong, 141
 Chittaranjan Locomotive Works, 28,
 304
 Cinema, 578
 Citizenship of Displaced Persons, 10
 Civil Defence, 193, 195
 Civil Disobedience Movement, 174
 Civil War, 24, 25
 Civilization, 274, 275, 357, 371, 380,
 381, 385, 420, 424
 Cold War, 23, 310
 Colombo Conference, 130
 Colonialism, 216, 243, 244, 276, 508,
 318
 Commonwealth, 129, 130, 267, 317
 Communal Spirit, 193
 Communal unity, 191
 Communalism, 146, 188, 350, 351,
 487
 Communications, Development in,
 433
 Communism, 23, 47, 239, 243, 265,
 266
 Communist Party, 18, 19, 21, 22
 Community Projects, 50-56, 350
 Congress, Indian National, 175, 442,
 478
 Cooch-Bihar, 235

Culture, 356-362
 Czechoslovakia, 370

D

Dacca, 140 to 144
 Dandi, 576
 Darjeeling, 38, 582
 Dawn, 235
 Declaration of Independence, Ame-
 rican, 197
 Defence, 261, 314
 Defence Services, 301, 311, 312, 532
 Delhi, 27, 166, 167, 181, 229, 257,
 333, 337, 386, 467, 525, 518, 588
 Delhi Agreement, 178, 180
 Democracy, 3, 12, 14, 15, 45, 49,
 81, 85, 90, 175, 198, 209, 219,
 267, 270, 278, 318, 319, 381, 395,
 416, 461, 510, 583
 Democratic Socialism, 47
 Deo, Sri Sankarrao, 166
 Deutsches Museum, 377
 Devanagari Script, 582
 Dever's Plan, 303
 Digwadih, 362
 Diplomacy, 133
 Directive Principles of State Policy,
 486, 488, 508, 514, 515, 522
 Displaced Persons, 9, 10, 33, 176
 Divide and Rule, Policy of, 34
 Dixon, Sir Owen, 190
 Dnepropetrovsk Dam, 26
 Dum Dum, 339, 340
 Durgabai, Srinati, 528
 Dutch, 308

E

East, 240, 560, 396, 397
 East Africa, 282
 East Bengal, 30, 33, 135, 136, 138,
 139, 141-144, 146-150, 158, 161, 165,
 167 to 170, 173, 174, 176, 185, 187,
 229, 230, 232, 448, 450
 East Pakistan, 156, 157, 167, 169
 Economic democracy, 80, 85
 Economic development, 76, 239
 Economic progress, 24, 199, 347
 Economics, 361
 Economists, 86
 Economy, Indian, 44, 50, 75, 82, 93,
 218, 554
 Education, 25, 68, 69, 382, 461
 Egypt, 227, 305, 324
 Election Commission, 9, 13

E—(Contd.)

- Election Manifesto of Congress, 1945-1946, 34
 Elections, General, 8, 9, 10, 12-16, 29, 209, 297
 Employment, 46, 63, 64, 84, 95, 96
 England, 46, 69, 203, 207, 267, 273, 275, 308, 324, 331, 405, 436, 455, 540
 English language, 315
 Europe, 9, 19, 46, 101, 198, 212, 215, 216, 222, 276, 277, 278, 281, 299, 356, 370, 375, 383, 384, 386, 396, 397, 416, 420, 421, 444, 445, 541, 561, 586
 European Civilization, 186
 European History, 83, 488
 European influence in Asia, 240
 European Powers, 209, 283
 European Problems, 239
 Evacuee Laws, 451
 Evacuee Property, 176, 192, 231, 232, 451
 Evacuees, 451
 Exchange of Population, Indo-Pakistan, 144, 159, 174, 175, 186, 233
 Exchange of Prisoners, Korean, 327, 328
 External Publicity, 284, 285
- F**
- F.A.O., 71
 Famine, Bengal, 408
 Far East, 101, 238, 249, 253, 254, 277, 278, 280, 281, 286, 321, 327, 345, 410, 416, 432
 Fascism, 20
 Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, 562
 First World War, 423
 Five Year Plan, 26, 63, 81, 89, 93, 94, 96, 329, 330, 332, 349, 352
 Five Year Plan, Second, 88, 89
 Food, 6, 26, 49, 58, 59, 76, 77, 79, 262, 263, 278, 350, 549, 550
 Food Policy, 1952, 74-80
 Food Production, 60, 61, 62, 95
 Food Rationing, 550
 Food Situation, 49, 58, 59, 157
 Foreign Affairs, 32, 121, 220, 246, 247, 258, 282, 298, 317
 Foreign Aid, 91
 Foreign Policy, 3, 5, 16, 17, 128, 132, 181, 200, 201, 220, 337, 394, 418, 441, 447, 549
- Foreign Possessions in India, 248, 286
 Formosa, 254
 France, 396
 Free Enterprise, 76
 Freedom, 3-6, 84, 182, 197, 199, 200, 207, 208, 217, 225, 276, 399, 454, 573, *See also* Independence
 Freedom, India's fight for, 3, 219, 226, 323, 324, 578
 French Indo-China, 396
 French Possessions in India, 303
 Frontier Areas, 225
 Frontier Province, 225, 229
 Fundamental Rights, 480, 486, 487, 488, 502, 521
- G**
- Gandhiji, 1, 68, 93, 134, 200, 204, 205, 215, 229, 275, 279, 291, 344, 369, 394, 398, 399, 400, 401, 417, 418, 430, 437, 535, 549, 572, 574, 575
 Ganga, 73
 Geneva, 370
 Geneva Convention, 327
 German Constitution, 522
 Germany, 9, 76, 305, 345
 Goa, 305
 Gokhale, Mr, 524
 Government of India Act of 1935, 501
 Graham, Dr Frank, 302, 303
 Greece, 383, 424, 541
 Gujarat, 58
 Gupta, Deshbandhu, 507
 Gurkha Province, 38
- H**
- Hague, 231
 Hague Court, 231
 Hanumanthaiya, Mr, 148
 Harijans, 64
 Harun Al Rashid, 542
 Heavy Industry, 84
 Himachal Pradesh, 14
 Himalayas, 66, 73, 92, 257, 358
 Hindi, 459
 Hindu, 428
 Hindu, the, 236
 Hindu Mahasabha, 131
 Hindus in East Bengal, 9, 138 to 141, 153, 155, 158, 159, 161, 170, 233, 450
 Hindus of Jammu, 193

H—(Contd.)

- Hindus of Kashmir, 103, 104
 Hindustan Aircraft Factory, 301
 Hitler, 315
 Holland, 336
 Homœopaths, 545
 Howrah, 167
 Hyderabad, 21, 26, 41, 335, 584
 Hydrogen Bomb, 149, 221, 222, 309

I

- Idealism, 265
 Imperialism, 105, 132, 216, 442
 Imperialists, 105, 209
 Independence, 20, 26, 221, 222, 263, 304, 312, 323, 442, 443, 454, 580;
See also Freedom
 Independents, 18
 India House, 288
 Indian Air Force, 339
 Indian Council for Cultural Relations, 356
 Indian Independence Act, 294
 Indian National Commission of UNESCO, 368
 Indian National Congress, *see* Congress.
 Indigenous Systems of Medicine Committee, Reports of, 541
 Indo-China, 226
 Indonesia, 243, 269, 276, 324, 351, 396
 Indo-Pakistan Relations, 152, 178, 184, 187, 289
 Indus, 192
 Industrial Development, 262, 350
 Industrial Revolution, 83, 86, 382, 385
 Industrialization, 84, 89, 218, 383, 417
 Industries, 97, 98, 410
 Industry, 84, 89, 199, 331, 363
 Industry, Chemical, 44
 Institute of Pacific Relations, 238
 International Affairs, 127, 219, 247, 274, 279, 340, 422, 444
 International Buddhist Cultural Conference, 390
 International Court of Justice, 231
 International Crisis, 274
 Internationalism, 418

J

- Jagirdari, 94, 586

- Jagirdars, 586
 Jagirs, 335
 Jammu, 301, 333
 Jammu and Kashmir, 100, 102, 180, 301, 333, 334, 352, 353
 Jammu Parishad, 335, 336, 353
 Jan Sangh, 18, 336
 Janata, 63
 Japan, 9, 321, 436, 437, 561
 Jihad, 192, 292, 293
 Jhelum, 192
 Journalism, 462
 Journalists, 284, 456, 466, 468
 Junagadh, 179

K

- Kalimpong, 582
 Karachi, 143, 173, 180
 Karnataka, 35, 37, 42, 330, 331
 Kashmir, 8, 21, 26, 32, 100 to 123, 132, 146, 150, 179, 180, 184, 185, 187, 188, 189, 193, 231, 289, 291 to 295, 300, 301, 302, 305, 333 to 336, 352, 353
 Kashmiris, 32, 354
 Kathiawar, 538
 Kerala, 37, 42
 Khadi, 98
 Khadi and Village Industries Board, 96
 Khan, Mr. Liaquat Ali, 157, 168, 177 to 180
 Khulna, 138, 139, 142
 Kidwai, Shri Rafi Ahmed, 57
 King, Mr. Mackenzie, 215
 K. M. P. Party, 18
 Korea, 242, 251, 252, 253, 260, 280, 281, 287, 301, 305, 319, 326, 327, 329, 343, 344, 548
 Korea, North, 249, 250, 253
 Korea, South, 249, 319
 Kripalani, Acharya, 269, 551, 558
 Kripalani, Srimati Sucheta, 165
 Krishii Pandit, 61
 Kultur, German, 357
 Kunzru, Pandit, 272, 337, 504, 510

L

- Lake Success, 237, 268, 280, 291, 372
 Land, Indian System of, 199, 208, 404
 Land Legislation, 477
 Landless Labour, 347
 Language, 39, 40, 581, 582

L—(Contd.)

- Lanka Sundaram, Dr, 33, 41, 79, 313, 316
 Laurier, Sir Wilfred, 215
 Law, 474, 477, 517
 Lawyers, 496, 499, 590
 League of Nations, 317, 340, 370, 522
 Lenin, 27, 581
 Liberty, 198
 Linguistic Provinces (States), 30, 33-43
 Local Self-Government, 209
 Lok Sabha, *see* Parliament
 London, 214, 268, 277, 288, 314, 370, 377, 548

M

- MacDonald, Sir John, 215
 MacNaughton formula, 230
 Madras, 35, 36, 41, 58, 60, 61, 334, 509, 514, 538
 Maha Gujerat, 41
 Maharashtra, 37, 41
 Maharashtrians, 35
 Mahatma Gandhi, *see* Gandhiji
 Maitra, Mr Lakshmi Kanta, 146, 147
 Malabar, 59
 Malaya, 282
 Malik, Dr, 157
 Manipur, 17, 31
 Marx, 47
 Marxism, 47
 Masani, Mr M. R. 259, 260
 Masaudi, Maulana, 189
 Mediator in the Kashmir dispute, 296, 302
 Medicine, the Modern System of 536-545
 Mehta, Dr Jivraj, 542
 Middle East, 227, 299, 384
 Ministry of Natural Resources and Scientific Research, 366, 367
 Minorities, 153, 159, 160, 172, 174, 450, 452
 Minorities, in Pakistan, 147, 149, 155, 450
 Mongolia, 39
 Mookerjee, Dr Syama Prasad, 16, 29, 32, 33, 37, 38, 101, 110, 111, 166, 169, 171 to 174, 183, 185, 288, 289, 300, 313, 339, 350
 Moscow, 268

- Mukerjee, Prof. Hirendra Nath, 25, 339
 Multan, 152
 Multipurpose Schemes, 410
 Munich, 377
 Murshidabad, 135, 139, 140
 Museums, 375, 378
 Muslim League, 188, 351
 Muslims, 9, 139, 140, 153, 194, 233, 234, 351, 354, 450
 Mysore, 58, 436

N

- Nagas, 17
 Narendra Dev, Acharya, 329, 332, 353, 354
 National Anthem, 28
 National Art Treasure Fund, 386
 National Conference, 189, 191, 193
 National Congress, *see* Congress
 National Emblem, 28
 National Flag, 14, 28
 National Laboratories, 362, 363, 366, 433, 559
 National Movement, 324, 352, 413
 Nationalism, 360, 361, 418
 Nationalism, in Asia, 216, 226, 242, 243, 417
 Nationalism, in India, 126
 Nationalization, 45, 509
 Nazi Germany, 76, 315
 Negroes, 227
 Nepal, 224, 225, 254 to 258, 270, 278, 502
 Nepal, King of, 257, 258
 New Delhi, 67, 388, 389
 Newspaper, the Modern, 235, 236, 452, 453, 454, 462-471; *See also* Press
 New York, 213, 237, 391
 Non-alignment, 326
 Non-co-operation, 174
 Non-interference, 220, 226
 Non-violence, 241
 North Africa, 299
 North East Frontier, 509
 North Korea, *see* Korea, North
 No-war Declaration with Pakistan, 177, 184, 232, 236

O

- Old Delhi, 388
 Opposition in Parliament, 17, 18, 20, 22, 26
 Orissa, 539

P

Pakistan, 9, 10, 21, 26, 29, 30, 32, 64, 77, 127, 130 to 134, 142, 144 to 148, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 159, 166, 171 to 173, 176 to 181, 183 to 187, 189, 190 to 194, 225, 228, 231 to 233, 235, 236, 247, 276, 289, 290, 291, 295, 302, 336, 337, 351, 396, 401, 441, 444, 445-448

Pakistan, Government of, 77, 135, 152, 158, 177, 231, 232, 446

Panmunjon, 328

Paris, 277, 370, 377

Parliament, 12, 15, 17, 81, 82, 90, 91, 319, 337, 338, 465, 474, 477, 481, 485, 490, 492, 494, 498, 502, 505, 506, 528, 553

Parliament, in England, 331, 483

Partition, 31, 39, 57, 133, 151, 208, 236, 289, 290, 291

Patel, Sardar Vallabhbhai, 38, 334, 546, 547

Peace, 116, 200, 218, 219, 246, 247, 259, 273, 274, 275, 277, 278, 281, 282, 306, 307, 326, 394, 396, 416, 418, 423, 460, 461, 548

Pearson, Mr., 214, 251

Peasant, Indian, 205, 399, 404

Peking, 227, 250, 268

Penal Code, Indian, 518

People's Democratic Front of Hyderabad, 18

PEPSU, 173

Phoenix, 126

Plan, *see* Five Year Plan

Planning, 52, 53, 55, 80, 81, 87

Planning Commission, 74, 80 to 83, 88, 497, 539, 555, 556, 567, 568

Plebiscite in Andhra, 35, 41, 42

Plebiscite in Kashmir, 119, 189, 293, 302

Politicians, 380, 466

Politics, 274, 380

Polling, 12, 13, 14

Portugal, 396

Portuguese Possessions in India, 303

Potsdam, 254

Praja Parishad, 332, 350, 352, 354

President of India, 8, 16, 17, 112, 126, 293, 320, 474, 485, 528, 546, 553

Press, 442, 443, 450, 464, 490, 491

Press, Freedom of, 456, 463, 464, 507, 519, 525, 526

Press in India, 117, 137, 178, 235, 455, 507

Press in Pakistan, 137, 142, 235

Press Laws Enquiry Committee, 507, 519

Preventive Detention Bill, 583-592

Princely States, 108; *See also* States, Indian

Private Enterprise, 45, 48, 509, 510

Provincialism, 59, 351, 580

Public Health, 538

Punjab, 58, 152, 166, 337, 450, 525, 588

Punjab Partition Committee, 180

R

Racial Discrimination, 217

Racialism, 248, 396, 417

Rajagopalachari, Mr., 516

Rajasthan, 450, 591

Rajpramukhs, 109

Raman, Dr., 363

Ranga, Prof., 271

Rau, Shri B. N., 230, 268, 303

Red Cross, International, 144

Red Fort, 1

Refugees from Pakistan, 2, 9, 17, 139, 141, 142, 143, 145, 155, 166, 174, 404, 405, 409

Rehabilitation of Refugees, 17, 53, 168, 169, 176

Republic of India, 7, 16, 108, 124, 197, 207, 278

Republic, Soviet, 63, 581

Republic of Spain, 522

Republic of United States, 198, 416

Revolution, 20, 62, 63, 87, 198, 397

River Valley Schemes, 27, 95, 209, 410

Roman script, 582

Rome, 383, 541

Roosevelt, Mrs., 213

Roosevelt, President, 203

Russia, 24, 27, 42, 266, 503; *See also* Soviet Union and U.S.S.R.

Russian Revolution, 25, 63, 347

Russians, 47

S

Sadar-e-Riyasat, 335

Saeed, Maulana, 191

Saha, Professor, 42

Salt March, 576

Samyukta Maharashtra, 41

San Francisco, 416

Sanchi, 390

S—(Contd.)

Sanskrit, 432
 Santhals, 139
 Sardar Patel, *see* Patel, Sardar Vallabhbhai
 Satyagraha, 335
 Saurashtra, 58, 591
 Scheduled Castes, 11, 56, 485, 509
 Scheduled Castes Federation, 13
 Scheduled Tribes, 11, 56, 485, 509;
See also Tribal Folk
 Science, 200, 217, 241, 359, 362 to 366, 371, 373, 374, 381, 412, 423
 Science Congress, Indian, 366, 367, 548
 Scientific Research, 366-367
 Scientists, 363-366
 Second World War, 423
 Secularism, 175
 Security Council, 8, 104, 106, 120, 190, 191, 230, 249, 253, 291 to 295, 300, 302, 303, 318
 Seoul, 252
 Shankar's Weekly, 435, 438
 Shaw, Bernard, 429
 Sikh Province, 42
 Sikhs, 103, 194, 351, 354
 Sind, 147, 229, 450, 451
 Sindri, 28, 95
 Social Reform, 482
 Socialist Party, 18
 Socialist Policy, 46
 Soekarno, Dr, 224
 South Africa, 130, 204, 228, 313, 345
 South America, 227
 South East Asia, 210, 216, 223, 269, 410, 416, 432
 South Korea, *see* Korea, South
 Soviet Union, 42, 43, 81, 83, 258, 311, 315, 321, 329, 347; *See also* Russia and U.S.S.R.
 St. Laurent, Mr, 214
 Stalin, Marshal, 249
 State Governments, 60, 78, 113, 330, 480, 530
 States, Indian, 13, 30, 39, 40, 59, 77, 107, 108, 109, 121, 501, 579.
 Statesmanship, 183, 184
 Steel, 410
 Students, 70
 Supreme Court, 112, 113, 478, 504, 517
 Swaraj, 62
 Syngman Rhee, President, 320

T

Tagore, 369, 431
 Technology, 423
 Telengana, 494, 584
 Tendulkar, D. G., 572
 Tennessee Valley Authority, 410
 Thakkar Bapa, 278
 Thimmayya, General, 303
 Thirty-eight Parallel, 268, 280
 Thoreau, 403
 Tibet, 254, 255, 257, 271, 272
 Tokyo, 436
 Travancore-Cochin, 92
 Tribal Areas, Christian Missionaries in, 579
 Tribal Folk, 278, 576-583; *See also* Scheduled Tribes
 Tripura, 150
 Truman, President, 252, 253, 260, 264
 Tunisia, 305, 318
 Two-nation Theory, 191, 194, 228
 Tyagi, Shri Mahavir, 125

U

U K *See* United Kingdom
 U.N. Commission, *see* United Nations Commission
 Unani System of Medicine, 542, 545
 Unemployment, 64, 96
 UNESCO, 368, 369, 371, 372, 374
 United Kingdom, 69, 107, 153, 250, 251, 258, 264, 266, 285, 292, 315, 327, 331, 405, 483, 490, 494, 552, 568
 United Nations, Charter of, 317
 United Nations Commission, 105, 120, 121, 190, 293
 United Nations Organization, 33, 71, 100, 115, 116, 118, 120, 121, 173, 180, 186, 190, 210, 220, 237, 238, 248 to 253, 268, 272, 280, 281, 286, 287, 291, 294, 299, 300, 301, 303, 317 to 320, 326, 327, 328, 340, 341, 355, 372
 United Provinces, 208, 477; *See also* Uttar Pradesh
 United States of America, 8, 45, 46, 48, 83, 153, 196, 197, 198, 201, 203, 204, 210, 211, 213, 222, 223, 249, 251, 252, 253, 258, 264, 266, 268, 284, 285, 316, 321, 327, 331, 342, 346, 415, 416, 417, 436, 489, 493, 510
 Universities, 424, 426
 University of California, 420

U—(Contd.)

- University of Ceylon, 421
 University, Columbia, 391, 398
 University of Saugor, 431
 UNO, *see* United Nations Organisation
 U.S.A., *see* United States of America
 U.S.S.R., 26, 249, 266; *See also*
 Russia and Soviet Union
 Uttar Pradesh, 14, 40, 41, 38, 61,
 233, 450
 Uttarkhand, 38, 42
- V
- Victoria Park, 140
 Village Industries, 84, 97
 Violence, 3, 4, 5, 21, 24, 35, 133, 138,
 419
 Vishala Andhra, 41
- W
- War, 21, 23, 24, 118, 119, 120, 160,
 183, 184, 217, 218, 259, 274, 279,
 280, 321, 345, 346, 363, 371, 392,
 396, 397, 413, 418, 465
 Washington, 196, 201, 213, 268
 Weimar Republic, 522
 Welfare State, 97, 332, 340
 West Bengal, 9, 10, 37, 38, 61, 132,
 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143,
 150, 155, 156, 161, 167, 171, 176,
 229, 230, 232, 450
 West, Countries of, 198, 217, 275,
 281, 383, 396
 West Pakistan, 9, 138, 166, 176, 351,
 451, 525
 West Punjab, 229, 450
 Western Asia, 209, 223, 299, 410,
 416
 Women, 125, 214
 Women of India, 213
 Wordsworth, 377
 World Peace, 4, 200, 217, 218, 274,
 417
 World War, dangers of, 5, 267, 279
- Z
- Zamindar, 495
 Zamindari, 91
 Zamindaries, 477